

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Founded by Nicholas Wiseman and others in 1836



THE PACELLI 'DIARY'

By Sir Alec Randall, K.C.M.G.

CHURCH AND STATE IN AUSTRIA

By F. M. M. Steiner

HANDEL AMONG THE CARMELITES

By James S. Hall

POLAND'S CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE

By Axel Heyst

MR TILLOTSON AND MR POPE

By J. M. Cameron

LONDON SUMMER 1959

Another important volume of Church history

The Church in the Dark Ages

Henri Daniel-Rops
(de l'Académie Française)

M. Daniel-Rops, author of *Jesus in His Time* and *Cathedral and Crusade*, here relates the history of the Catholic Church in the period c. 406-1050. A magnificent history presenting six centuries of the Catholic World, the administration, rise, and fall of Churches, empires and dynasties.

The volume opens with a brilliant study of St Augustine of Hippo, stressing his influence upon the dark centuries which followed his death. It includes detailed examinations of the most important personalities and events within the centuries it describes.

640 pages. With maps in the text, Chronological Table, and full Index. 42s.

OBTAINABLE AT ALL BOOKSHOPS

*A detailed prospectus may be had post free from the Publishers:
J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., Bedford Street, London, W.C.2.

DENT

Father Martindale's latest book
THE CASTLE AND THE RING

has already sold out its first edition in England and is now reprinting

This wonderful account of a Ring made from the Magi's gold and its journey through the centuries, including a long stay in an English Castle, and a sequel story of its influence in modern times, has been acclaimed by critics and general readers. Many have considered it to be the author's finest piece of writing.

'A pageant in print from A.D. 80 to the present day . . . Part II) is an intriguing "period" story on its own.'—CATHOLIC HERALD

'Father Martindale has found a most stimulating theme . . . (he) writes with the grace and lucidity of a great classical scholar.'—TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT

'THE CASTLE AND THE RING is attractive as fiction, as hagiography and for the style of writing. An excellent choice as a present for young people, it will please and profit also their seniors.'—THE UNIVERSE

'This is certainly vintage Martindale. All the exhilarating properties of a vintage wine and all the profound spiritual qualities we associate with a wine that is sacramental.'—THE TABLET

266 pp.

Full cloth binding with art dust-jacket.

12s. 6d.

Also in preparation, the same author's

JOCK, JACK AND THE CORPORAL

a 'catechism in dialogue form' written with humour and understanding as only Father Martindale could write it. Long out of print and much in demand, this book will now appear as a **CAMPION PAPERBACK**, price 5s.

Latest catalogue, with order form and publication dates, available on request.

CAMPION PRESS LIMITED

33 Queen Square
LONDON W.C.1

6 Cope Street
DUBLIN

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Founded by Nicholas Wiseman and others in 1836

LONDON: THE TABLET PUBLISHING COMPANY LTD.

NUMBER 480 SUMMER 1959

Price 6s., plus postage : Subscription 25s. per annum, post free : U.S.A. \$4

CONTENTS

- The Pacelli 'Diary': The Approach to the Lateran Treaties 99
By Sir Alec Randall

- Church and State in Austria 107
By F. M. M. Steiner

- Handel Among the Carmelites 121
By James S. Hall

- Catholic Higher Education in France 132
By Germain Brulliard

- A Letter from Paris 148
By Emile Gabel, A.A.

- Mr Tillotson and Mr Pope 153
By J. M. Cameron

- Poland's Contemporary Literature 171
By Axel Heyst

- Television Drama 179
By Mary Crozier

Books Reviewed:

- The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins.* Christopher Busby 183
The Sermons and Devotional Writings of Gerard Manley Hopkins.
Christopher Busby 183
Fountain of Justice. Mark Doughty 192

Another important volume of Church history

The Church in the Dark Ages

Henri Daniel-Rops
(de l'Académie Française)

M. Daniel-Rops, author of *Jesus in His Time* and *Cathedral and Crusade*, here relates the history of the Catholic Church in the period c. 406-1050. A magnificent history presenting six centuries of the Catholic World, the administration, rise, and fall of Churches, empires and dynasties.

The volume opens with a brilliant study of St Augustine of Hippo, stressing his influence upon the dark centuries which followed his death. It includes detailed examinations of the most important personalities and events within the centuries it describes.

640 pages. With maps in the text, Chronological Table, and full Index. 42s.

OBTAINABLE AT ALL BOOKSHOPS

*A detailed prospectus may be had post free from the Publishers:
J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., Bedford Street, London, W.C.2.

DENT

Father Martindale's latest book

THE CASTLE AND THE RING

has already sold out its first edition in England and is now reprinting

This wonderful account of a Ring made from the Magi's gold and its journey through the centuries, including a long stay in an English Castle, and a sequel story of its influence in modern times, has been acclaimed by critics and general readers. Many have considered it to be the author's finest piece of writing.

'A pageant in print from A.D. 80 to the present day . . . Part II) is an intriguing "period" story on its own.'—CATHOLIC HERALD

'Father Martindale has found a most stimulating theme . . . (he) writes with the grace and lucidity of a great classical scholar.'—TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT

'THE CASTLE AND THE RING is attractive as fiction, as hagiography and for the style of writing. An excellent choice as a present for young people, it will please and profit also their seniors.'—THE UNIVERSE

'This is certainly vintage Martindale. All the exhilarating properties of a vintage wine and all the profound spiritual qualities we associate with a wine that is sacramental.'—THE TABLET

266 pp.

Full cloth binding with art dust-jacket.

12s. 6d.

Also in preparation, the same author's

JOCK, JACK AND THE CORPORAL

a 'catechism in dialogue form' written with humour and understanding as only Father Martindale could write it. Long out of print and much in demand, this book will now appear as a CAMPION PAPERBACK, price 5s.

Latest catalogue, with order form and publication dates, available on request.

CAMPION PRESS LIMITED

33 Queen Square
LONDON, W.C.1

6 Cope Street
DUBLIN

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Founded by Nicholas Wiseman and others in 1836

LONDON: THE TABLET PUBLISHING COMPANY LTD.

NUMBER 480 SUMMER 1959

Price 6s., plus postage : Subscription 25s. per annum, post free : U.S.A. \$4

CONTENTS

- The Pacelli 'Diary': The Approach to the Lateran Treaties 99
By Sir Alec Randall

- Church and State in Austria 107
By F. M. M. Steiner

- Handel Among the Carmelites 121
By James S. Hall

- Catholic Higher Education in France 132
By Germain Brulliard

- A Letter from Paris 148
By Emile Gabel, A.A.

- Mr Tillotson and Mr Pope 153
By J. M. Cameron

- Poland's Contemporary Literature 171
By Axel Heyst

- Television Drama 179
By Mary Crozier

Books Reviewed:

- The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins.* Christopher Busby 183
The Sermons and Devotional Writings of Gerard Manley Hopkins.
Christopher Busby 183
Fountain of Justice. Mark Doughty 192

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is published quarterly, at the end of March, June, September and December.

All articles are copyright throughout the world, and may not be reproduced without the express permission of the Editor.

All communications, articles and books for review should be addressed to THE DUBLIN REVIEW, 128 Sloane Street, London, S.W.1.

Articles can only be received on the understanding that publication alone is a guarantee of acceptance and payment.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is regularly analysed for the *International Index to Periodicals* (H. W. Wilson & Co., New York).

Notice to American subscribers: THE DUBLIN REVIEW has entered into an agreement with University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, to make THE DUBLIN REVIEW available to libraries in microfilm form. Sales are restricted to those subscribing to the paper edition, and the film copy is only distributed at the end of the volume year. Inquiries concerning purchase should be directed to University Microfilm, 313 N. First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

Nihil obstat: ADRIANUS VAN VLIET, S.T.D., *Censor Deputatus.*

Imprimatur: E. MORROGH BERNARD, *Vic. Gen.*

Westmonasterii, die 20a Maii 1959.

THE PACELLI 'DIARY'

The Approach to the Lateran Treaties

By ALEC RANDALL

THE twentieth anniversary of the death of Pius XI fell this spring on the day before the thirtieth anniversary of the signature of the Lateran Treaties, with which that great Pope's name will always be associated. It was an admirable plan, conceived by the late Pontiff in 1957, and confirmed by his successor, to celebrate the double anniversary by the publication of the daily notes—they were not actually called a Diary—which the brother of Pope Pius XII, the Marchese Francesco Pacelli, kept throughout the long negotiations, from 5 August 1926 to 7 June 1929, which led up to the signature and ratification of the Treaty, Financial Agreement and Concordat.

The existence of Pacelli's Diary was known for some years; it was mentioned in the authoritative *Enciclopedia Cattolica* in 1952, in the article on Francesco Pacelli, who at his death confided it to his brother, Pius XII. The Vatican Press has now¹ published it in a handsome volume of some 550 pages, and the editor, Mgr Michele Maccarone, has amplified it with notes, a short introduction, and the text of the treaties and concordat in their various drafts and in their final form, as well as with minutes, memoranda and letters, sometimes with Pius XI's own corrections and interpolations. It is an exceptionally important, though necessarily incomplete, source for the history of the Lateran Pacts. As Mgr Maccarone remarks, a complete documentation must await the opening of the archives of the Holy See and the Italian Government. Since, according to present practice, the wait is likely to be long, historians will meanwhile welcome this ample new material.

The two active negotiators of the Lateran Pacts were Francesco Pacelli for the Holy See and Domenico Barone, Legal Adviser, for the Italian Government. A fact less well known is that when Barone died on 4 January 1929, Mussolini decided not

¹ *Diario della Conciliazione: con Verbali e Appendice di Documenti*. By Francesco Pacelli. Edited by Michele Maccarone. Libreria Editrice Vaticana. Città del Vaticano. Price 3,500 lire.

to replace him, but expressed his confidence in Pacelli by asking him, with the Pope's willing concurrence, to be the sole negotiator. Pacelli had for some years been legal adviser to certain Roman Congregations, but he had also taught jurisprudence at the University of Rome, and later had served the Municipality of Rome as a legal expert. When the Pacts were concluded he refused to become a citizen of the Vatican City, and kept up his professional relations with the Roman civil authorities. He was well qualified to appreciate the points of view of both sides. The Diary shows that the same may be said of Barone, who in the course of the discussions returned to the practice of his faith, and died fortified with the rites of Holy Church and a special Papal Blessing. It was a fortunate circumstance that the two chief day-to-day negotiators were not only good professional colleagues, but friends with a just mutual understanding of the respective interests of the Holy See and the Italian Government. As the documents show, when some excess of Fascist action against Catholics, or some intemperate public remark by Mussolini threatened a breakdown of the whole negotiation, either Pacelli or Barone was able to take conciliatory measures and get the talks going once more.

The qualities of the two chief negotiators were of great importance. Yet the Diary reinforces the conclusion that, at every stage of the prolonged discussions, the Pope kept a tight control over them; the corrections he made in certain drafts show that details did not escape him. Not quite such conclusive evidence has been published on the part played by King Victor Emmanuel and Mussolini. Certainly Mussolini took an intense interest in the discussions; he was obviously extremely anxious to reach agreement and prepared to make substantial concessions in order to do so. So much is clear from the Diary, with its regular record of Mussolini's views as conveyed by Barone. But Mussolini's real thoughts on the Papacy, and even more the King's attitude generally, are, one feels, still not fully revealed. There are indications, hints, but only a deeper study of Mussolini's biography, and more material on the King's sentiments, could really fill out the story. In contrast, as one might expect, the personality, the motives and the qualities of Pius XI, both as Supreme Pastor and as statesman-diplomat, stand out from the Diary more clearly than ever; uncertainty remains only on one or two details, which will be mentioned later.

The course of the negotiations was made known in general

terms even before the agreements were ratified. The very day of the signature, and two days later, Pius XI, addressing the Lenten preachers and then members of the University of Milan, gave an account of the principles that had guided him. On 12 February Francesco Pacelli gave the Press an account of the meetings. The debate in the Italian Parliament revealed more details. In particular the Italian Government's report, signed by Mussolini, and his long speeches to the Chamber and Senate, on 13 and 23 May, were used extensively in Professor Binchy's *Church and State in Fascist Italy*, published in 1941. So, also, was the book *Date a Cesare*, which Mussolini's supporter Mario Missiroli published in August 1929. This, after a superficial review, on familiar Fascist lines, of the relations between Church and State in Italy, gave hitherto unpublished documents which 'a fortunate chance' had put in the writer's possession. He printed, in fact, the *Schema del Trattato*, the working draft of the Treaty on which Pacelli and Barone had provisionally agreed on 26 November 1926. This, Missiroli suggested, showed that the Holy See had had to retreat from its original demands (*primitive richieste*). The Italian Government, although it had obviously permitted the 'leakage', felt it necessary to declare Missiroli 'unauthorized'. On 1 December, however, the book was indirectly condemned by Pius XI and put on the Index, thereafter being forgotten in the much more serious polemic between the Holy See and the Fascist Government which culminated in the Pope's famous Encyclical, *Non abbiamo bisogno*, of 29 June 1931.

A more important contribution to history than Missiroli's was to come in 1942 with Carl Alberto Biggini's *Storia inedita della Conciliazione*. This book, planned in 1939 but delayed by the war, contained several texts of letters from Mussolini to Barone and Pacelli, drafts and minutes, sixteen of them in facsimile. Apparently the Italian Government did not consult the Vatican before allowing these disclosures, and Biggini's comment was often tendentious; for example, he tried to minimize the significance of the *Non abbiamo bisogno*, and slurred over the Pope's later protests against the racial laws which the Fascist Government had promulgated, 'influenced' (Biggini said) 'by the intensified political and cultural relations between Fascism and National Socialism, between two powerful totalitarian states'. On the whole, however, Biggini's tone was far less controversial and provocative, and his disclosures do not seem to have been criticized. Certain of

them, in fact, give a favourable picture of the Pope's attitude. A letter from Barone to Mussolini of 10 October 1928, on Pius XI's *desiderata*, speaks of the Pope's 'noble and patriotic spirit of conciliation (*arrendevolezza*)'. Mussolini returned a reply highly respectful to the Pope—an example of Barone's value as an intermediary. Mgr Maccarone, in his edition of the Pacelli Diary, has included documents published by Biggini, or has given references to them. But, as mentioned before, the innermost thoughts of Mussolini in those critical years seem to me still to await an authoritative expositor.

The way for the first contacts between Pacelli and Barone was prepared by the exchanges between the Holy See and the Italian Government over the Fascist Minister Rocco's proposals in 1925 for reforming ecclesiastical legislation. The Pope's comment that he could not recognize legislation 'unless preceded by proper negotiations and agreements with this Holy See and with Us' was followed by Rocco's withdrawal of the Bill on the subject and an expression of his hope of reconsideration 'on a wider basis'. A 'certain prelate' then mentioned to Barone the possibility of talks. It was assumed that this was the Jesuit Father Tacchi-Venturi, a well-known intermediary with Mussolini. But in fact, as shown here, it was Mgr Luigi Haver, of the Propaganda Congregation, who conveyed the hint to the Minister Federzoni. The result appeared in the first entry in Pacelli's diary:

5 August. Counsellor Barone asked to have a talk with me about the Roman Question.

It was arranged that the initiative should come from the Italian Government. On 6 August Pacelli saw the Pope, who authorized the talk with Barone and said the main point was the recognition, by other nations, 'of the absolute sovereignty of the Pope over the territory to be assigned to him'.

The idea of consultation with or recognition by other nations was later emphasized in a letter from Cardinal Gasparri to Pacelli, dated 24 October 1926. Mussolini had already concurred—Diary entry for 28 August—in the desirability of consulting the leading nations, and was optimistic, he said, about the replies which would come from Great Britain and France. But the proposal was soon abandoned. The Diary gives no reasons. It is clear, however, that preliminary consultations outside the extremely narrow circle in which the talks were taking place would have

endangered their absolute secrecy, to which both sides gave paramount importance, and which was preserved so remarkably to the very end. Moreover, bringing other governments into consultation and, still more, any kind of international guarantee, seemed to have been ruled out by Cardinal Gasparri long before when, in an interview on 28 June 1915, he had declared that the Holy See looked, for a regularization of its position, 'to the Italian people's sense of justice'. With this may be compared Pius XI's question on the day of signature:

Where shall we find guarantees . . . if not in the consciousness of Our own just cause, if not in the conscience and sense of justice of the Italian people, if not, still more, in God's Providence?

The next question was the area over which the Pope's sovereignty should be exercised. On 11 September the Diary records that in a talk with the Pope the possibility was mentioned of enlarging the Vatican territory by incorporating the Villa Doria-Pamphili. In principle the Italian Government was not opposed to granting to the Holy See the unrestricted and irreversible use of this additional territory, but on 1 October 1926 Pacelli records that on consulting 'various Cardinals' Cardinal Gasparri had found them favourable to the discussions, but desirous that 'the territory to be assigned to the Holy See should be the smallest possible so as not to create difficulties in governing it'.

The Villa Pamphili proposal was nevertheless maintained for several months and it was not until 21 August 1928 that, the Diary records, the Holy Father confirmed his proposal to renounce the Villa Pamphili and the necessary communicating zone, 'in order to make the solution of the Roman Question simpler and more lasting'.

On 26 October the Pope told Pacelli he had heard that the King was opposed to the proposed solution of the Roman Question; accordingly he was prepared to limit the territory to the Vatican alone, and, in order to avoid all responsibility for a breakdown of the negotiations, he wished this to be conveyed to the King and Mussolini. When Pacelli told Barone the following day, the latter exclaimed:

If they do not accept these conditions, then they are imbeciles. Not accepting would mean a decision to continue the dissension (*dissidio*), that they do not want to end the dissension. But I can assure you that Mussolini is not thinking like that.

This suggests that there was a difference of opinion between Mussolini and an intransigent King, but the Diary throws no further light on this interesting point. On the very eve of the signature, when the Agreements were printed, the Pope gave up sovereignty, already conceded, over the Palace of the Holy Office, the Museo Petriano and adjacent territory, and decided to remain content with ex-territorial status, as agreed in regard to several other properties of the Holy See.

One may deduce that Pius XI felt he could afford these concessions of form, as also a reduction in the financial compensation, because he had secured two points of substance. These were the unreserved recognition of Papal sovereignty over the Vatican City and a satisfactory Concordat. The Diary shows what difficulties had to be overcome in regard to both. The Pope had proposed at the outset, as a *conditio sine qua non*, complete and exclusive sovereignty over what, he suggested, would be called 'the State of the Holy See'. The King seems to have been particularly opposed to conceding sovereignty over what was, in his view, geographically Italian soil. In particular the term 'State' was disliked, and 'Papal City', 'City of the Pope' and 'City of the Vatican' were proposed as alternatives. Eventually the Italian Government deferred to the Pope's wish; the Preamble to the Treaty spoke of constituting 'the Vatican City, recognizing on the same the full ownership of the Holy See and its exclusive and absolute power and sovereign jurisdiction', while by Article 26 'Italy recognizes the State of the Vatican City under the sovereignty of the Sovereign Pontiff'. There could be no clearer expression of the visible independence of the Holy See.

The Concordat was more difficult. The conditions desired by Pius XI in this case conflicted not only with some kind of dynastic pride, but with the entire Fascist conception of the overriding authority of the State. There are some dramatic entries on this. More than once the Pope threatened to break off the negotiations if he were not given satisfaction over the suppression of Catholic organizations, and after an interruption he won his point. The recrudescence of the dispute in 1931 falls outside the scope of the book. Bitter though it then became, it brought no move to denounce any of the agreements, including the Concordat, in which the Pope, against stiff opposition, had obtained his conditions regarding marriage, and a good part of his desiderata regarding religious instruction in the State schools. Such instruction in the

high schools and universities was not insisted upon; the Pope was satisfied with Article 36:

Italy considers the teaching of Christian doctrine according to the received form of Catholic tradition to be the foundation and crown of public education,

coupled with an undertaking to extend religious instruction to other schools by special arrangement. Over the marriage clause of the Concordat (No. 34) to which in the first draft in 1927 particular importance was attached by the Holy See, there was a hitch almost at the last moment. On 19 January 1929, Pacelli records, Rocco refused to agree to the Pope's proposal intended to safeguard the sacramental nature of marriage. The Pope said he would make no further concession, and Article 34 was agreed to in the form he desired:

The Italian State, wishing to restore to the institution of marriage, which is the basis of the family, that dignity which is in conformity with the Catholic traditions of its people, recognizes the civil effects of the sacrament of marriage as regulated by Canon Law.

The Diary is for the most part calm and even laconic; in one pathetic entry on 31 March 1928 Pacelli mentions, in a parenthesis, the death of his 'dearest son, Giuseppe, of the Society of Jesus'. But there are dramatic pages, not only before, but even more, perhaps, after, the signature. Pius XI was, as is well known, particularly indignant at the interpretation which Mussolini gave to the Agreements when commending them to the Fascist Parliament. In an effort, which publications like Missiroli's were intended to reinforce, to disarm anti-clerical critics, extol the achievements of the Fascist regime and conciliate the upholders of the Garibaldian ideals of the Risorgimento, Mussolini exaggerated the Pope's concessions, reaffirmed the supremacy of the State and—most criticized of all by the Pope—declared that Christianity would have remained an obscure Jewish sect if it had not come to Rome. On this, on 15 and 29 May Pacelli describes interesting talks with Mussolini. He said his declaration was not in accord with his own convictions, and that he had been bound to defend himself against the 'atrocious accusations' made in Italy and also abroad, that he had re-established the 'Temporal Power' and thrown the State into the arms of the Church. He said he

would not object if the Pope publicly expressed his point of view. However, Mussolini's promise to give satisfaction when he made his speech to the Senate was not kept, and when Pius XI's outspoken letter to Cardinal Gasparri appeared on 2 June 1929 Pacelli had a strenuous time trying to keep Mussolini's anger from causing an indefinite delay in the ratifications; 6 June, in particular, he says, was 'a regular field day' (*giornata campale*). There was also difficulty in finding a formula linking the Treaties to the Concordat in a way which satisfied the Pope. Eventually, in three successive audiences with both sides, Pacelli got accepted his draft of a *procès verbal*, signed at the same time as the ratification, putting loyal observance, 'in word and in spirit', of the Treaty and Concordat on an equal footing. The last entry records the ratification ceremony, the exchange of telegrams between Pius XI and Vittorio Emanuele, the Holy Father's joy at the happy conclusion, and the Diary ends with a

LAUS DEO.

The story, of course, did not stop there. But it would take us too far to describe the way in which the validity of the Treaties and Concordat was in 1947 recognized in the Constitution of the Italian Republic. Those who in 1929 criticized Pius XI for making agreements with the Fascist dictator, and prophesied that when he fell they would fall too, have not been justified. Whatever the apparent inconsistencies and potential difficulties, Pacelli's Diary shows, at all its stages, the skilful development of a relationship between the Holy See and the Italian State which satisfied two main tests—it gave the Papacy (what the unilateral Law of Guarantees did not) that manifest sovereign independence it required for the exercise of authority over the whole Catholic world, and it freed the Church in Italy from State exploitation and control, while at the same time committing a Catholic nation to Catholic principles regarding marriage and the place of religious teaching in the national educational system. Whatever the future may hold—and that, as the Pope said, was 'in God's hands and therefore in good hands'—it was no small achievement to have made a settlement with the Fascist dictator such as could outlive his overthrow by some years. In a purely political and national sense, one may say of the Lateran Pacts that they did not undo the Risorgimento; they completed it.

CHURCH AND STATE IN AUSTRIA

By F. M. M. STEINER

This study, occasioned by the indeterminate General Election held in Austria last month, is historical in its approach in the belief that only through history can its subject be made intelligible. It takes its place in the series on the relations of Church and State in the free countries of the modern world which began in the autumn of last year with a paper on the position in Italy and was continued in the winter with one on the position in France.

IN BERLIN the situation is frequently serious, but never hopeless; in Vienna it is always hopeless but never serious.' This old witticism at the expense of Austrian public affairs might almost be said to apply to the relations between Church and State; for over a year there has been something like a crisis in the relationship between the Holy See and the Austrian Government, but it has not affected the friendly, even close, relations, and, while everyone reiterates the need for an early solution, there seems no sense of urgency. Yet, in theory, Austria is under severe reproach from Rome for breach of treaty. Perhaps it is a not unprecedented state of affairs; perhaps, indeed, it is one to which both parties have been accustomed for years.

The situation in Austria is full of paradoxes: 89.9 per cent of the population call themselves Catholics, but only about one-third of them practise. Church and State are so closely interconnected that neither side can conceive of so simple a solution as separation on the American model; yet there is no Established Church, and in theory the legal position of the Catholic Church

does not differ much from that of the other 'Religious Bodies Recognized by Law'.

I

The same problems recur in different centuries, however different the circumstances: there were disputes of a very similar nature in the 1780s when Pius VI found it necessary to visit Vienna, in 1870 when the Austrian Government unilaterally denounced the Concordat, and in 1957-8, when the Austrian Government declared itself unable to apply the provisions of a later concordat which it admitted to be valid. Yet the protagonists on the Austrian side were very different indeed—a Holy Roman Emperor who was an absolute monarch, a constitutional Emperor with a parliamentary majority cabinet, and the coalition government of a small republic. The only explanation is that the controversies were not really the same, despite appearances.

In the old days it was a straight fight between the Church and the rights of the Crown: in the nineteenth century it became a three-cornered contest between Church, Crown and party politicians; in the mid-twentieth century it looks like being a straight fight between Church and State again, not because the parties have disappeared but because in contemporary Austria State and party have almost become one.

The close relationship between Church and State goes back to the Middle Ages. The traditionally strong position of the Dukes of Austria in Church matters was strengthened in the late fourteenth century when during the 'conciliar troubles' the Austrian Church was unable to keep order in its own house; for instance, the State was appealed to when the ecclesiastical authorities could not by themselves restore discipline in religious houses which were badly in need of reform. The precedent was thus set for close supervision of monasteries and convents by the Prince, and these rights were not relinquished when the situation had returned to normal. This position of the Austrian dukes and archdukes was further strengthened when they began to succeed regularly to the Imperial Crown and the Popes were anxious to obtain the support of the Holy Roman Emperors, and willing to grant privileges in return. Pope Eugene IV granted to Frederick III the right of nominating the bishops of six important sees, and the Concordat of Vienna

(1448) added, *inter alia*, the see of Vienna to this list, as well as the right of nomination to a hundred important benefices in the Emperor's Austrian territories alone.¹

When the spread of the Reformation all over Central Europe in the late sixteenth century was checked only by the secular arm, the Church in Austria owed its very survival to the Habsburg dynasty. The foundation was thus laid for that development during the next 200 years which culminated in the Josephinic 'reforms' of the 1770s and 1780s. It is too superficial to blame Joseph II alone for a development that had started well before he reached the throne: the driving force behind most anti-clerical measures was Prince Kaunitz, who had already been chancellor under Maria-Theresia, and there was a general trend for the extension of monarchical absolutism at the expense of the Church—as witness the Bourbon pressure on Rome to dissolve the Society of Jesus. But undoubtedly the Emperor's own views and the force of his exceptionally strong personality left an imprint on the Church in Austria of which traces could be seen until well into this century. The eventual result was, in Fr Eder's expressive phrase, a 'State and Police Church'.² The secular clergy were generally regarded as imperial officials—in fact they so regarded themselves—and even religious seemed to think that men enter religion to serve the State. A monk writing in Vienna in 1813 refers quite naturally to '... societatibus ecclesiasticis . . . ut ii qui has societates ad operam suam *rei publicae* navandam inierint . . .'³ (*italics mine*). It should be remembered that the first generation of liberals, indirect ancestors of a later anti-clericalism, were trained by a clergy and by teachers, particularly of law, indelibly stamped by that State Church. Professor Eder points out how the 'typical Josephinic pastor' could be found at least until the middle of the following century, characterized by his 'conscientious fulfilment of his duties, loyalty to the State and the secular authority, and . . . lack of any very profound theological formation'.⁴

Except for private endowments and private obligations such as those of the patrons of individual livings, the Church and clergy became financially dependent on the State. The immense assets of the numerous monasteries and convents of the contemplative

¹ Cf. F. Maass, *Der Josephinismus in Oesterreich*, particularly Vol. 1; Vienna, 1951.

² K. Eder, *Der Liberalismus in Altbösterreich*, Vienna, 1955; p. 133.

³ Meinrad Lichtensteiner, O.S.B., *Historia Gymnasii ad Scotas*, quoted in *134. Jahresbericht des Schottengymnasiums in Wien, 1807–1957*, Vienna, 1957; p. 20.

⁴ Eder, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

Orders secularized under Joseph II were embodied in the *Religionsfonds*, a fund earmarked in 1782 firstly for the support of the ex-contemplatives who had perforce to become secular priests, and secondly for the personal and material requirements of the new parishes set up. It also shouldered the financial obligations of the patron for any parish that did not already have a private patron. The fund, though not State property, was administered by the State and through inefficient management eventually became inadequate for its purpose, so that until 1938 its revenues and a State subsidy, together known as the *Kongrua*, paid for a great deal of the Church's expenditure, as well as the salaries and pensions of the secular clergy.

With all this, it may be surprising that the Church did not become Erastian as some Eastern Church so dependent on the State might have done. There was, however, an intermingling of ecclesiastical and secular personnel and activities that recalled the French Gallican or English State churches of the seventeenth century, rather than the nineteenth or twentieth. Clergy in high secular offices were not unknown even in the 1930s; on the other hand, the last Holy Roman Emperor, the Austrian Emperor Franz I, was successful in improving the theological training and spiritual formation of the clergy throughout his lands by a purely secular act of State. On the advice of his senior chaplain, Abbot Frint, Franz I in 1816 set up a 'Higher Seminary', practically in his own house and very much under his own eyes. This Institute, usually known as the 'Frintaneum' after its founder and first head, was established in a building adjoining the imperial palace. It was intended to train selected priests who were likely to become seminary teachers or rectors, or future Professors at theological faculties, and thus to disseminate its spiritual influence as widely as possible. This object was probably achieved: in a hundred years of existence the Institute trained some eight hundred and fifty priests, in the words of the Imperial Cabinet Rescript, 'under my own immediate orders'. Despite this imperial origin, the *alumni* included one future Patriarch, three future Cardinals, nine eventual Archbishops and some sixty bishops—all of them men who were first and foremost priests and 'in no way courtiers in Holy Orders'.¹

The revolution of 1848 brought freedom not only to the peasantry but also to the Church. Clear evidence of this lies in the

¹ F. Funder, *Aufbruch zur christlichen Sozialreform*, Vienna, 1953; p. 24.

holding of the first meeting of the Austrian episcopate in 1849; such conferences had not been permitted before. In 1850 the new Emperor, barely twenty years old and destined to rule until the age of eighty-six, abolished the *Placetum Regium* and allowed the bishops free correspondence with the Holy See. Subsequently he instructed Archbishop (later Cardinal) Rauscher to initiate negotiations with Rome, and a Concordat signed in August 1855 was enacted as Austrian law in November that year. It was in no way a subjection of Crown and people to ecclesiastical dictatorship. Rauscher was a loyal 'King's Man', and Franz Joseph himself, though personally devout, was too conscious of traditional imperial privilege to accept much encroachment on his rights. Even so, there was a sharp reaction from the liberal intellectuals and the rising bourgeoisie against such provisions as that for the application of Canon Law to marriage and divorce, and against the rights of supervision over elementary schools granted to the Church. The equally prominent objections to freeing the Church from State bondage were really illogical, based as they were on an autocratic, Imperial tradition, rather than on liberal ideas for separation of Church and State.

Ten years later these and other objections could take practical shape, for after 1860 Austria acquired a parliamentary system in which liberal thought was then dominant. In 1867 draft bills for new 'Basic Laws' (a kind of Bill of Rights) envisaged the restoration of the pre-Concordat laws governing marriage, and new restrictions were planned in the schools question. (The initiative for this did not, of course, come from the Monarch). Throughout the winter of 1867-8 Austrian ambassadors in Rome unsuccessfully attempted to obtain agreed modifications to the Concordat, and in May 1868 the parliament in Vienna acted. Several laws dealing with school and marriage regulations were clearly incompatible with the provisions of the Concordat, and some of their provisions contravened Canon Law on general points. By late June a papal allocution had already denounced these May Laws as *nullius in roboris esse et fore*. The bishops used their relative freedom to protest, and Count Schaaffgotsch, Bishop of Brünn (Brno), instructed parish registrars to enter civil marriages as 'concubines'. But for the Emperor's immediate free pardon, Bishop Rudigier of Linz would have served a short sentence of rigorous imprisonment, for publishing a Pastoral Letter which the Linz Court adjudged as a breach of the peace.

In the summer of 1868 further attempts to abrogate the Concordat were made by ministers, on the grounds that Hungary had had autonomy and constitutional government restored the year before, and now refused to accept a concordat concluded while it had no say in the matter. Laws enacted which plainly conflict with a valid concordat, protests that it is invalid because concluded by an unconstitutional government—the parallel with the 1940s and 1950s seems complete: but here the resemblance ends, for in the earlier case the Concordat was denounced unilaterally and never modified or revived.

Within two days of the Vatican Council's decision to define the dogma of papal infallibility, the Austrian and Hungarian cabinets persuaded the Emperor to their point of view that a wholly new situation had arisen; that the character of the papacy had been changed by the new dogma to such an extent that it was no longer identical with the contracting party that had concluded the 1855 Concordat; and that through a complete change in the nature of the one partner the Concordat had automatically lapsed. An Imperial Rescript dated 30 July 1870 declared that the 1855 Concordat had lapsed, and that the November Decree enacting its provisions was accordingly repealed. A formal note from Rome, disagreeing and protesting, reached Vienna in October, but had no practical effect.

The subsequent *modus vivendi* lasted in many ways for sixty years. The 1874 Religious Laws adopted by Parliament were unacceptable to the Episcopate, but the personal intervention of the Emperor smoothed over many of the difficulties, and the bishops formally upheld the Concordat but in practice co-operated. After all, religious marriage continued to enjoy full civil effect, marriage remained indissoluble for Catholics, and in the 'deconfessionalized' schools religious instruction at State expense, and even certain religious observances for Catholic pupils, remained guaranteed by law.

II

By this time the chief antagonist to the Church's claims was no longer the Crown but the politicians: Franz Joseph, who was personally devout, did not press all the claims that his liberal ministers sought for him. Party politics, with an unreformed

franchise, were still restricted to a relatively small circle—the aristocracy who were either liberal, or Catholic and conservative, and the rising bourgeoisie who were generally liberal. The clergy, so soon to take a prominent part in that side of public life, were not yet to the fore, and the two great popular parties had not yet made their appeal to the masses. The bishops were on the whole conservative.

The violent party controversies of the 1850s and 1860s were not yet primarily concerned with economic matters, but as the century wore on these obtruded themselves more and more. While the industrial revolution had brought with it enormous development, the economic benefits in Austria were as unevenly spread as elsewhere, and the increasing wealth of industry and commerce—where the supporters of the *laissez-faire* school found their natural home—was matched by the misery of the small artisans and the peasants, both of whom were ruined by the excesses of unrestrained capitalism. On the Catholic side, a few members of the nobility, such as Baron Vogelsang and Prince Alois Liechtenstein, began to think of social enquiry and reform, but still in a conservative context. During the 1880s this spirit of enquiry was matched by progressive members of the clergy who called for reforms, and eventually they were joined by laymen independent of the conservative wing.

By 1891 there was a detailed programme, launched for the general election of that year and propounded by Alois Liechtenstein and by Dr Karl Lueger, the virtual founder of the Christian-Socialist Party and future Mayor of Vienna. Within the Catholic fold this represented a distinct left wing: Prince Liechtenstein was regarded as having 'gone red',¹ and the young party incurred the mistrust at one and the same time of their natural foes, the liberals and Pan-German nationalists, as well as of the Court and bureaucracy, the conservatives, and, largely, the episcopate. Nearly seventy years later, when the Christian-Socialist Party has for so long been regarded as belonging to the Right and as the natural opponent of the Left, it is salutary to recall that this was not always so; that its early appeal to a few social scientists and reformers, and to Catholics of the lower-income groups, was one of aggressive anti-capitalism (as shown by Lueger's large-scale municipalization of most public services in Vienna), and that for over ten years the Catholic side was not at all united. There were two

¹ Funder, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
Vol. 233. No. 480.

Cardinal Gruscha of Vienna, to present to the Pope a formal charge against the Christian-Socialists as a subversive, immoderate, and anti-semitic organization.

The formal charge was again passed to Mgr Schindler for response. His detailed refutation, again signed by him and Prince Liechtenstein, was dated 24 February 1895, and this time he personally presented it to the Holy Father. Leo XIII received him kindly, approved his programme—after all, the Pope of *Rerum Novarum* would appreciate a Christian movement for social reform—and sent his paternal blessing to Dr Lueger. This time the battle was won, and the Christian-Socialists' position as the Catholic party *par excellence* remained unchallenged. The general election of 1907 established it and the Social Democrats as the two largest parliamentary parties, and the present position in the Austrian Republic where their two successor parties between them now hold 157 out of 165 seats in the federal lower house, stems directly from that occasion.

There were various reasons for the participation of so many priests in journalism and party politics. One was undoubtedly the feeling that everyone in public employment, whether teacher, politician, civil servant or—dare one say it—cleric, was a public servant, and that there was no watertight division between any of these functions. Teaching staffs in secondary schools and universities—including teachers of divinity and professors in Faculties of Theology—are still civil servants with ranks and grades assimilated to those of senior administrative officials. Since the clergy drew State revenues for their ecclesiastical needs, and State allowances for their civil functions as Registrars of births, deaths and marriages, to draw a civil service or parliamentary salary probably seemed no different. In addition the numerical strength of the Catholic masses lay in the peasantry at a time when the bourgeoisie was largely of a liberal frame of mind, and in the country the clergy were those most likely to have the education needed for a public defence of Catholic policies. Whatever the reasons, the early Catholic journalists were frequently priests, and the clergy took a prominent part in parliament and the provincial assemblies.

Catholic dailies, the well-endowed *Vaterland* which enjoyed the support of the nobility and most bishops, and the small, struggling *Reichspost*, which, although founded by a priest, did not even find its staff given access to the ante-room of Cardinal Gruscha, the aged Archbishop of Vienna.

In 1894 the Minister for Religious Affairs and Education, Dr von Madejsky, drafted a memorandum which in effect asked for a papal condemnation of the young party. This was presented to the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs by Cardinal Count Schönborn, the Archbishop of Prague, but was not yet a formal ecclesiastical complaint. Inspired by liberal members of the cabinet, who exploited conservative prejudices on the Catholic side, this attack misfired. Largely through the intervention of Mgr Agliardi, then Nuncio in Vienna and later Cardinal Bishop of Albano, Mgr Schindler¹ and Prince Liechtenstein were given the opportunity to submit a reasoned defence in the form of a programme of action and statement of principles which earned the approval of Cardinal Rampolla, the Secretary of State. (This led later to the suggestion by the Social Democrat historian Ludwig Brügel, that here was the reason for Franz Joseph's veto against Rampolla in the conclave of 1903—a suggestion that is apparently quite unsubstantiated.) The immediate consequence was thus not what the attackers had expected; in fact a *rapprochement* between Lueger and Ebenhoch, the two parliamentary leaders of the Christian-Socialist and Catholic-Conservative parties, followed. The Christian-Socialist movement eventually took first place within the Catholic group, and a formal union between the two parties followed in 1907, in time for the first general election to be fought under universal suffrage. Finally, in 1912, the *Vaterland* was merged with the *Reichspost*, its owners generously handing over their list of subscribers.

To return to the request for a papal condemnation, the attack was renewed a year later, and this time seemed more serious. It was, in February 1895, no longer a matter of a politician's private submission being forwarded by a Cardinal, but a formal episcopal complaint when Cardinal Schönborn appeared before Pope Leo XIII 'in solemn audience'.² He was accompanied by Bishop Bauer of Brünn and by Fr Weiss, O.P., the personal representative of

¹ F. M. Schindler (1847–1922), Professor of Moral Theology at Vienna, one of the early sociologists and social reformers; later Protonotary Apostolic, Rector of Vienna University and a Life Member of the Austrian House of Peers.

² F. Funder, *Vom Gestern Ins Heute*, Vienna 1953, p. 144.

when the Vienna City and Provincial Administration—firmly in Socialist hands—encouraged its officials to leave the Church, reached an unprecedented pitch after the internecine fighting in February 1934 between the socialist workers' militia, the *Schutzbund* and Government forces backed by right-wing volunteer groups. Widows of Socialist victims who were badly in need of *Caritas* aid refused to touch help from *die Christlichen*. Since the 1934 constitution was enacted against Socialist protests by a rump parliament consisting entirely of Christian-Socialist deputies, the Concordat and the regime that went with it were fatally compromised in the eyes of many Socialists, even when they were not doctrinaire anti-Christians.

The German occupation brought a fundamental change in this as in so many other fields. The common hostility to the Nazi oppression brought an underground rapprochement between Socialist and Catholic resisters undreamed of five years earlier. Moreover, the Nazis lost little time in putting their inherently anti-religious policies into practice. The establishment, in itself unexceptionable, of civil registrars of births, deaths and marriages was coupled with the introduction of a German law dating back to Bismarck's *Kulturkampf* which, for the first time, made civil marriage compulsory, and in addition made it a criminal offence for any priest to perform the religious ceremony without a previous civil wedding. The Catholic schools, particularly the distinguished grammar schools conducted by the religious Orders, were closed down under various pretexts in less than six months, and compulsory teaching of religion in the public schools was abolished less than a year after the *Anschluss*. The same Decree of February 1939 also cancelled all contractual State payments for such instruction.

The same year, however, saw a more determined onslaught. Under the guise of giving the Catholic Church (as well as the Protestants and the Old-Catholics) power to levy a church-tax among their members, the National Socialist authorities stopped all payments from public funds for clerical salaries, the maintenance of ecclesiastical buildings, the obligations of the public patronage rights undertaken in 1782, and all similar contributions and subsidies. Since these payments were a compensation for the *Religionsfonds*, this measure amounted in effect to a large-scale confiscation of property; the cutting off of the contractual pensions for retired clergy was particularly mean, as it meant the

III

With the fall of the Monarchy the *modus vivendi* of the previous forty-five years survived to a surprising extent. The Crown's rights of presentation and nomination lapsed and all bishops were again named by the Holy See. There was no concordat, but by the Laws of 1874, recognized by the bishops in practice if not in theory, canonical obstacles to marriage retained their civil effect, and religious instruction in the State and municipal schools remained compulsory, the teachers being paid out of public funds. Anachronistically perhaps, the clergy (like those of the other 'Recognized Religious Bodies') retained the functions of Civil Registrars, and were paid by the State for this—in the case of Catholic priests out of the *Kongrua*. In 1922, in fact, the position of the Catholic clergy in regard to pay and pensions was in all respects assimilated to that of the regular civil service, with a contributory pension scheme.

During the 1920s negotiations for a new concordat were begun by Chancellor Schober and were brought to a conclusion in 1933 when Cardinal Pacelli and Chancellor Dollfuss signed a new concordat which largely confirmed the existing position and would have been non-contentious but for two factors. There had been a change of regime, from parliamentary to corporative, since the Concordat was first drafted, and almost accidentally the Concordat came to be widely associated with the authoritarian constitution of 1934 which enacted it into law. In addition there was one field in which the Government had gone further in its concessions to the Church than a parliamentary cabinet would have done: Catholic marriages became subject not only to canon law but also to ecclesiastical tribunals. Not only would the State continue to pay for religious teaching in the public schools, but the Concordat provided for the possibility of State assistance to Catholic private schools where these helped to relieve pressure on the national educational system and thereby saved public expenditure.

For roughly thirty years the Church and the Christian-Socialist Party had been politically identified. This was unfortunate because it automatically alienated the large majority of the industrial workers, who belonged to 'the other party', from any form of Christianity and not merely from its political manifestation. The bitterness that had been fermenting for fifteen years

many months, the case with the Concordat—the Government cannot officially utter any opinion whatsoever.

As soon as the State was re-established in 1945, Rome and the Catholics in the Government demanded restitution for all damage inflicted by the German occupation on the Church, and the re-establishment of the Concordat. The latter was in practice bound to be much more difficult; apart from the formal objections of the Socialist members of the Government, who regarded the Concordat as having been arbitrarily and unconstitutionally enacted in 1934, to re-establish ecclesiastical tribunals, to make Catholic marriages indissoluble even in civil law, and to re-establish parish instead of civil registration, was clearly not practical politics. On the other hand, to restore the existence of Catholic schools and religious instruction in the national schools, as well as the operation of the wide range of wholly non-contentious provisions of the Concordat, proved feasible.

And so, while the Concordat was in dispute, many of its provisions were quietly observed by the Government and the Holy See. Until the end of the Allied Occupation in 1955 this problem, like so many others, could not finally be settled. The continuation in force of the German marriage law in all its severity and with its provisions for easy divorce was the only really serious blot in a picture which in practice was much more satisfactory than it looked on paper. The contentious points at issue were now reduced to three; marriage and divorce, schools, and property. Of these, the marriage problem is the most intractable, as no obvious compromise seems to have occurred to the protagonists of compulsory civil marriage and the defenders of the old pre-1938 order. The Anglo-Saxon system, whereby a church or minister of religion is licensed to solemnize marriages which are nevertheless reported to the Civil Registrar, would seem a feasible way out. The severity of the German law has, however, been alleviated by a judgement in December 1955 of the Austrian Constitutional Court, which declared the criminal sanction against religious ceremonies without previous civil wedding to be unconstitutional and therefore invalid. The bishops have nevertheless instructed the parish clergy not to solemnize such marriages unrecognized by the State, except in the most special circumstances. In the schools question the arrangements envisaged by the 1934 Concordat are almost in operation again, except as regards private schools which do not now receive any subsidy. This does in fact endanger the existence

confiscation of the pension contributions paid by these priests over many years.

If this measure was intended to deal the Church a crippling blow, it did not succeed. In much the same way as the churches in some satellite countries are now fuller than they were in democratic days, since Catholic practice is one discreet way of showing opposition to the current Communist regime, the church contributions in Austria twenty years ago began to flow in at an unexpected rate. To pay one's church tax became a point of honour with nominal Catholics who had not set foot in a church for years. The way in which these measures were taken is, of course, inexcusable, and the Nazi regime inflicted substantial damage on the Church in a large number of ways—through the confiscation of monastic property and schools, the conscription and even persecution of priests, the suppression of religious teaching, and so on. But the economic existence of the Church was not destroyed.

The political situation in Austria since 1945 has been much healthier than in the first republic, except for the all-pervading power of the Coalition parties in all spheres of life. Former enemies have co-operated in a Coalition Government for fourteen years, and have come to appreciate each other. Party political differences have decreased, partly because the Social-Democrats have tried to get away from their previous narrow base as a doctrinaire Marxist party, to one that can appeal to all voters, including practising Christians. The Austrian People's Party, the *Volks-partei*, is admittedly the successor of the old Christian-Socialists, but it too has cast its net wider. Most important of all, the Church has withdrawn from party politics, and the Hierarchy is now—officially—strictly neutral between the parties that the clergy have been forbidden by the bishops to accept any public office. (This does not, of course, apply to such State appointments as school or university teaching, but practically all other forms of public life are now a party matter.)

Since the first post-war election of 1945 the two big parties have had a 'coalition pact' by which they are pledged to co-operate in government and parliament, and to accept the unanimous decisions of the inner council of Ministers making up the 'Coalition Committee'; this has in effect given the Socialists, who have never yet achieved a majority, a veto over all governmental activity. Formal decisions of the Council of Ministers must by law be unanimous, and if no agreement can be reached—as was, for

cordat must be applied to the letter, difficult though this might be in the present condition of Austrian politics. In the event an arrangement *praeter legem*, such as applied for decades after the 1870 disagreement, seems likely.

Meanwhile State and Church co-exist very closely indeed. The Corpus Christi procession in Vienna is no longer an official high Act of State, as in the days of the Monarchy, but when Archbishop Dellepiane, the Nuncio in Vienna, recently celebrated a jubilee, it was President Schaerf who gave a luncheon party for him. Dr Schaerf was not only a Socialist before he became President, but was one of the old guard who had formally left the Catholic Church many years ago. More significant still, when Archbishop Koenig went to Rome last December to receive the Red Hat, a solemn reception in his cathedral was arranged for his return. The *Te Deum* for this ceremony was again attended by President Schaerf, obviously in his official rather than in a personal capacity.

Such instances have been multiplied during the last twelve months. They seem to imply that the results of the general election which has just taken place will not affect Church-State relationships either way. The majority party are no longer pure 'clericals' and the Socialists no longer implacable foes.

HANDEL AMONG THE CARMELITES

By JAMES S. HALL

WAS George Frideric Handel ever a Catholic? The formal answer must be 'no' but Dr Percy Young thinks that it was a very near thing. In the recent *Symposium of Handel*, published by the Oxford University Press in 1954, he writes:

As a matter of musical interest, Catholic ritual impressed itself on Handel's mind, always alive to colour and pageantry, in no uncertain terms. His *Salve Regina* is an unmistakeable act of chivalrous

of many of them; it is also unfair, as the State saves an enormous amount of money: every third kindergarten in the country is maintained by the Church, as also are eleven out of fourteen training colleges for women teachers, four out of ten of the men's teachers' training colleges, and not less than one in every four grammar and similar schools. It is estimated that Catholic schools and similar establishments subsidize the Austrian State to the extent of 170 million Austrian Schillings (just under £2.5 m.) per year.

Compensation for the property sequestrated is not likely to present an insuperable difficulty. The Austrian Government is obliged under the State Treaty of 1955 to make restitution to all victims of Nazi oppression, whether persons persecuted on racial or religious grounds, religious organizations, Austrian trade unions, or British oil companies. All parties—that is, the Coalition as well as the small independent right-wing opposition in the Chamber—are agreed that these international obligations must be honoured. Since no final settlement has been reached, Parliament has agreed to payments on account of final compensation for all the religious bodies affected. In the case of the Catholic Church these payments are to amount to Sch. 100 millions for 1958 and 1959 (approximately £1,450,000 per annum) pending a settlement by 1960. This settlement will probably finally liquidate the *Religionsfonds* which has been dwindling ever since 1782. What is left is mainly real property, principally woodland already administered by the State, which can easily be consolidated with the State Forests. It should be said in fairness that the compensation question is, in practice, not as urgent as may be thought. The habit of paying church taxes has survived surprisingly, even though the basis of assessment is not conspicuously fair. The Archdiocese of Vienna, for instance, is understood to have an annual contributions intake of Sch. 300 m. (£4,350,000 approximately) and therefore 'to be better off than ever before'.

While these practical questions gradually approach a solution, the formal question of the Concordat looks further away from a settlement than ever. After years of denying the validity of the 1934 Concordat, the Socialist ministers in the Cabinet, late in 1957, agreed to a formal recognition, on condition that it was not to be enforced in Austria and that a new concordat more in keeping with current conditions was negotiated. This did not satisfy the Holy See, which throughout 1958 insisted that the Con-

devotion before the Queen of Heaven. Handel was, of course, catholic; he might well have become a Catholic had his post-graduate course in Italy been prolonged beyond a three-year term.

There is also the less serious evidence that the famous Domenico Scarlatti crossed himself every time Handel's name was mentioned, and that during the composer's life in England the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1733 accused his chief singer, Senesino, of being a Jesuit in disguise.

Handel's relations with the Roman Church have always puzzled his biographers. So has the music he wrote for it, and no historian has been able to assemble his fourteen known pieces of Latin Church Music into a coherent whole, or to tell us for whom or for what occasions he wrote them. William C. Smith, alone, came near the truth when in listing eleven of them in his fine catalogue of Handel's works for the *Symposium* mentioned above, he noted that a psalm *Nisi Dominus*, an antiphon *Hec est regina virginum* and a motet *Saeviat tellus* may have been written for the Festival of Madonna del Carmine in Rome. Later, in the Leipzig *Handel Jahrbuch* for 1956, he added another motet, *Te decus virginum*, to this list.

It is perhaps fitting that in the bicentenary year of this great composer's death a solution should be offered to all these problems. This has proved to be largely a liturgical one, and after several years of research it can now be said with confidence that Handel's compositions for the Roman Church in general, and the Carmelite Order in particular, laid the foundation for all his later success in life.

The known facts are not without romance. Handel, then a young Lutheran of twenty-one, left Hamburg in 1706 to follow the lure of Italian music in Catholic Italy. By giving music lessons for the previous year he had saved enough money for his journey, and it is believed that he carried a letter of introduction from the impecunious Giovanni Gastone de' Medici to his brother Prince Ferdinand of Tuscany. One biographer remarks quaintly, 'For he resolved to go to Italy on his own bottom, as soon as he could make a purse for that occasion.'

Music historians differ about the chronology of Handel's first year in Italy, but the usually reliable Streatfeild thought that he left Hamburg in the summer of 1706 to pay a brief visit to his mother in Halle on his way south, entering Italy by the well-trodden Brenner route to reach Florence in September or October

1706. It is probable that he stayed at the Pratolino as a guest of Prince Ferdinand, the eldest son of the Grand Duke Cosmo III. Either at this time or at a later visit he wrote and produced an opera, *Rodrigo*, which greatly enhanced his reputation and brought him a handsome present from his patron.

An illuminating entry in the Valesio Diary of 14 January 1707, whose discovery we owe to Sir Newman Flower (*George Frideric Handel*, 1947), describes Handel's arrival in Rome:

There has arrived in this city a Saxon, an excellent player on the cembalo [harpsichord] and a composer of music, who has today displayed his ability in playing the organ in the Church of St John [Lateran] to the amazement of everyone.

Subsequent biographers take this statement in their stride, but it offers a problem to any Catholic reader. This is the Pope's own cathedral as Bishop of Rome, and the Mother Church of the Universal Church. How did Handel, a professed heretic, come to be in such a place, and who invited him to play in it? The paradox of the composer becoming the close friend of four Cardinals, one of whom (Benedetto Pamfili) wrote an ode in his honour, despite his refusal to become a Catholic, is an interesting study.

Handel's first biographer, the Rev. John Mainwaring, a Protestant clergyman, is also puzzled. He writes in 1760:

As he [Handel] was familiar with so many of the Sacred Order, and of a persuasion so totally repugnant to theirs, it is natural to imagine that some of them would expostulate with him on that subject. For how could these good catholicks be supposed to bear him any real regard without endeavouring to lead him out of the road to damnation? Being pressed very closely on this article by one of these exalted Ecclesiastics, he replied, that he was neither qualified, nor disposed to enter into enquiries of this sort, but was resolved to die a member of that communion, whether true or false, in which he was born and bred. No hopes appearing of a real conversion, the next attempt was to win him over to outward conformity.

After further details Mainwaring continues:

The generality looked upon him as a man of honest, though mistaken principles, and therefore concluded that he would not easily be induced to change them.

Handel was foremost a composer of operas—he wrote forty-five before his *Messiah*, and had composed four before leaving Hamburg. It must have been a sad blow to him on arriving in Rome to find that opera was still under a Papal Edict, since the grand Opera House, the *Tor di Nona*, had been destroyed as an immoral building by Pope Innocent XII ten years before. On the other hand, liturgical and chamber music were enjoying a great vogue. The Marquis Ruspoli fostered the latter in an 'Academy of the Arcadians', amongst whose 'shepherds' were counted four Popes (Clement XI, Innocent XIII, Clement XII and Benedict XIII) together with many members of the Sacred College. In this gathering Handel, together with Arcangelo Corelli and the Scarlattis, came as a welcome guest, though he was too young for actual membership, the regulation age being twenty-four. During his stay in Italy he composed nearly a hundred cantatas for voice, harpsichord and other instruments, some of which rank amongst the finest of his works.

But it still seemed necessary to find some way in which Handel overcame this religious barrier and acquired at least one powerful sponsor in the Sacred College itself. This might have been achieved by some outstanding musical composition for the services of the Church, or his undertaking to provide some such music. A process of elimination suggests that his religious patron was Cardinal Carlo Colonna.

Mainwaring tells us that 'While he (Handel) was in Rome, he was also much and often at the palaces of the two Cardinals, Colonna and Pamphili[sic].' This latter, Cardinal Pamfili, the one who wrote an ode in his honour, also provided him with the libretto for one of his early oratorios, *Il Trionfo del Tempo*. Cardinal Ottoboni is said to have gathered round him all the poets and musicians in Rome, and Cardinal Vincenzo Grimani of Naples later provided Handel with the text of his successful opera *Agrippina*. We have plenty of evidence that the last three Cardinals used Handel's talents to further secular music, but of Cardinal Colonna little is known. But his name is so closely linked to our further research that there can be little doubt concerning his interest in obtaining Handel's services for the Catholic Church.

A further important reference to Cardinal Colonna by Mainwaring, when Handel revisited Rome twenty-two years later, reads as follows:

On his arrival in Rome [in 1729] he received a very friendly and obliging letter of invitation from Cardinal Colonna, with a promise of a very fine picture of his Eminence. But hearing that the Pretender was then at the Cardinal's, he prudently declined accepting both the invitation and the picture.

It is only fair to remark that at this time Handel was established in England, enjoying a Court appointment by favour of George II and the Hanoverian dynasty. We shall suggest later that Handel's apology was accompanied by a gift of one of the finest motets ever written for the Catholic Church. This is *Silete Venti*, for Soprano solo, accompanied by an oboe and full string orchestra. Its highly dramatic style may be gauged by the fact that the first word of the singer, 'Silete!', stops the rushing orchestra in its tracks; and it ends with the 'Presto' *Alleluia*, a hundred and one bars long, which Handel also used with striking effect in his 1732 revival of the oratorio *Esther*.

At first sight, the hopes of finding any outstanding Mass or Church service set by Handel seemed remote, though it was decided to submit the remaining thirteen pieces of Latin Church Music associated with him to a critical musical and liturgical analysis.

In all, as manuscripts in Handel's own writing, or in copies bearing his name, we find the following. They are a motley collection.

(1) A copy in Handel's hand of a six-part motet by Legrenzi, *Intret in conspectu tuo*.

(2) and (3) An unfinished *Kyrie* and *Gloria* for a Mass for five voices.

(4) A *Magnificat*, attributed by some to a composer named Erba. Much of its music was used later in *Israel in Egypt*.

(5) A *Te Deum* attributed by some to a composer named Urio. We find its music used again on the grand scale for the *Dettingen Te Deum* thirty-six years later in 1743.

(6) A *Salve Regina*.

(7) and (8) Two Antiphons. *Hec est Regina Virginum* and *Te decus virginum*. All we know about these is that they were found in the Colonna Library in Rome before their sale by auction in 1878. They were described by W. H. Cummings in the *Musical Antiquary* of January 1912 as soprano and alto solos respectively with string and organ accompaniment. All trace of them has since disappeared.

(9) Another long motet, *Seuiat tellus*.

(10) to (13) Four Psalms, a *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate Pueri* (two settings) and a *Nisi Dominus* which has a magnificent *Gloria Patri* for eight voices and double orchestra, a startling composition for its early date and bearing in mind the composer's youth.

Fortunately, three of these psalms are signed and dated, so that we can say with certainty that Handel began their composition shortly after his arrival in Rome. The *Dixit Dominus* is dated April 1707, one *Laudate Pueri* 8 July 1707, and the above-mentioned *Gloria Patri* 13 July 1707. When first discovered, again in the Colonna Library, this last manuscript (sadly lost in a fire at Bristol in 1860), was thought to be a separate composition, and was published as such by Messrs Novello & Co. about 1890. By a happy chance the late A. W. Bourne was able to prove without doubt that it was musically connected to the *Nisi Dominus*, which lacks its Doxology and was published without one by Chrysander in 1872. Handel plays the liturgical joke of going back to his own beginning at the '*Sicut erat in principio*', and, incidentally, gives himself a lot of extra trouble in the process. The beginning of the *Nisi Dominus* is the striking arpeggio structure he made use of again twenty years later for the opening bars of his Coronation Anthem *Zadok the Priest*. Bourne's deduction is confirmed by the fact that Handel does the same thing in the '*Sicut erat*' of the dated *Laudate Pueri*, his beginning in this case being the music he used some years later for the introduction of his *Utrecht Jubilate*. The alternative setting of the *Laudate Pueri* is a more simple composition and by general consent is thought to be an earlier manuscript dating back to the composer's residence in Hamburg or Halle about 1703.

At this stage we received expert help from a liturgical scholar in the Benedictine Order. He noted that the *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate Pueri* and *Nisi Dominus* are three of the psalms used in that order in the Office of Vespers of Our Lady, the psalm *Laetatus sum* only being wanting. The *Magnificat* falls into place and, allowing for minor changes in rite, so does the *Salve Regina*, while, of course, a *Te Deum* is an appropriate ending to any solemn occasion. Except for noting that the two Antiphons *Hec [haec] est regina Virginum* and *Te decus Virginum* were strongly associated with the Blessed Virgin, we could not at present accord them a place. This left us with *Seuiat tellus*, a strange motet about the Carmelites, whose manuscript fortunately still exists in the

Egerton Collection at the British Museum. We found its history and contents both extraordinary and helpful.

The manuscript was bought by W. H. Cummings at an auction sale by Messrs Sotheby in February 1878 of the library of the Rev. E. Goddard, an Anglican clergyman, together with the Antiphons and *Gloria Patri* already mentioned, described as *Contemporary MSS purchased from the Colonna Library, probably all unpublished*.

Suuiat tellus is a manuscript in oblong folio, written in an eighteenth-century copyist's hand, and consists of seventy-eight pages, the last twenty-three containing a long *Alleluia* in triple time, its sixty-six bars closely resembling the finale of the other motet, *Silete Venti*, already described. At the 1732 revival of *Esther* one critic remarked that 'Strada gave us a Halleluia of half an hour long', so we can say on musical grounds that no audience would be offered the two motets together at the same sitting. On the first page of *Suuiat tellus* is written the following note:

On the 16th July, the festival of the Madonna del Carmine, a grand Mass was accustomed to be celebrated at the Church of the Madonna di Monte Santo in the Piazza del Popolo at the expense of the Colonna family to whom this manuscript formerly belonged, it being purchased at the public sale of their property. E. Goddard.

The title reads:

Motetto a Canto Solo con v.v. e Oboe
Per la Madonna Ssma del Carmine
Del Sig. G. F. Hendel.

This spelling of his name was consistently used by the composer during his life in Italy, though he changed it later on arrival in England.

The text inside gave us a great deal of trouble. The script is corrupt and by no means free from abbreviations and mistakes. But again our Benedictine friends came to the rescue and amended the corrupt Latin, together with providing a scholarly translation:

Saeviat tellus inter rigores;
Carmelitae, (ne pavete), impetente turbine.
Fremat Lucifer inter ardores,
Arbitri Ditis minas irridete.

Carmelitarum ut ordinem confirmet
 Dormienti Honorio Virgo apparet.
 Quidem luce nox coruscat et lux augetur,
 Cum qua, si confertur, turpis est sol, turpis est luna.

O nox dulcis, quies serena,
 Carmelitis sis longa, sis stabilis:
 Non te turbet tristis Megaera
 Dum Maria lux nitet amabilis.

Stellae fidei, vobis sit cura
 Carmelitas mundo servari:
 Vestra pax sit firma et segura
 Qua mortales debent beari.

Sub tantae Virginis tutela,
 Carmelitae, triumphate.
 Imbellis est Lucifer; innoxia sunt tela,
 Carmelitae, jubilate.

And this is the translation:

Although the earth is full of savagery and harshness, and we are buffeted by fierce winds, you should be fearless, Carmelites, and doubly fearless. Lucifer may rage at you from out his flames, but you, you may laugh at the menacings of the Lord of Hell. (Remember how once) the Virgin herself came in a vision to Honorius the pope as he slept, to defend your Carmelite Order. Then indeed was the night made brilliant with the light (of her presence); an increasing light that makes both sun and moon to seem dusky.

O happy night, of such quietness and serenity, may you be the lot of the Carmelites for many ages: may you be confirmed to them unalterably. Megaera, the savage Fury, cannot violate your peace while Mary, our light, shines with such love.

And you the stars of the Faith (the Saints?) now that your peace is fixed and firm, that peace by which men are to be made blessed, it is for you to keep the Carmelites from the world.

And you, O Carmelites, guarded so greatly by the Virgin herself, do you triumph. Disarmed is Lucifer and blunted are his weapons.

Rejoice, O Carmelites.

It must be assumed that the expert Handeliens, such as Cummings and Barclay Squire, who examined this manuscript during the past hundred years, could make little of it, and one Latin scholar at the British Museum regarded it recently as a garbled account of some esoteric rite. But to a Catholic, knowing that Pope Honorius III, after a vision of the Blessed Virgin in his sleep, approved the foundation of the Carmelite Order in 1226,

the motet has a clear-enough meaning. It was not so clear why Handel, of all people, should devote his time to praise of the Carmelite Order, and in an unstinted form. The verse which begins '*O nox dulcis*' has a most beautiful musical setting which he used later for the famous song *Vieni O figlio* in his opera *Ottone*. Handel was amongst the most versatile of all great composers and his music always reflects his environment. In this instance he gave his patrons full value, and Dr Percy Young's remarks about the *Salve Regina* are, if anything, an understatement. Its ending has a quality of Catholic intensity which few Handelians would recognise as their composer's work.

Our next approach was (in 1955) to the Carmelites at Aylesford, whose foundation dates back to 1245. Their Prior, the Very Rev. Patrick W. Russell, O.CARM., was most helpful. His letters 'confirm the celebration of the Feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel within the Order as early as 1376. There can be no doubt, therefore, of its celebration in the Church of Santa Maria di Monte Santo, which was most definitely a Carmelite Church until 1870. The Feast was extended to the Universal Church in 1726.'

All Handelians know about their composer's reputation for speed. His *Messiah* was written in three weeks, and even his most elaborate operas were often staged within a fortnight of completion of his original manuscripts. Therefore the fact that the *Gloria Patri* of the *Nisi Dominus* was not completed till 13 July would be no bar to its inclusion in the festivities of our Lady of Mount Carmel on 16 July in Rome.

In another letter, Father Prior says:

We do have proper hymns and anthems for the Feast, but those at present in use are of comparatively recent date and do not coincide with those you mention. The psalms for the Office are the same and the *Salve Regina* has a special place in our Mass and in all the hours of the Office. It has been a tradition with us to try to provide the best music for the July 16 Festival. It is quite possible that because of the popularity of the Feast of Carmine with the Italians, that the Cardinal Protector of that period or some other influential person was able to procure the best, in this case by the great Handel.

His final advice was that we should write directly to the Rev. Joachim Smet, O. CARM., who was the Historian for the Order in Rome.

It took Father Joachim Smet over a year to reply to our detailed questionnaire, but when this reply came in January 1957, Vol. 233. No. 480.

it was extremely helpful. He was able to tell us that in the Vespéral Offices for the Feast of our Lady of Mount Carmel, printed in Venice in 1700, the first two Antiphons in First Vespers were *Haec est regina virginum* and *Te decus virginum*. The psalms for Second Vespers were *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate Pueri*, *Laetatus sum*, *Nisi Dominus* and *Lauda Jerusalem*. When we refer back to the list of Handel's Latin Church Music, and allow for the probable loss of some original manuscripts, there can be no reasonable doubt about the purpose for which they were written.

Unfortunately Father Smet was unable to trace any record of this actual performance of music in the Monte Santo archive for 1707. This is a pity, for nothing like it as a musical setting for Vespers could ever have been heard before. It is on record that Mendelssohn, visiting the Royal Music Library over a hundred years ago, reverently kissed the autograph manuscript of the *Dixit Dominus* before returning it to its place. The author of this article has only heard it sung once, and then by a Lutheran choir behind the Iron Curtain (of all places) but he can only commend Mendelssohn for his action.

We had hoped to trace a direct connexion between Cardinal Colonna and the Carmelites, or the Church of Santa Maria di Monte Santo, but Father Smet could only give us negative evidence. He wrote: 'Santa Maria . . . a relatively modern church is not one of these (i.e. a church with a Cardinal as its Patron)'. But he follows with a helpful comment:

The fact is particularly puzzling that it (this great ceremony) was held in Santa Maria in Monte Santo, a small circular church of no particular distinction, the twin of Santa Maria dei Miracoli across the way. This points definitely to the intervention of some particular person connected by office or preference to this church.

Yes indeed, but the fact that we have independent evidence that the Colonna family bore the cost of the grand Mass there on 16 July, and that Cardinal Colonna sent Handel such a warm invitation many years later (in 1729), suggests that we need scarcely look any further for the *fons et origo* of Handel's Latin Church Music. It almost certainly follows that Handel's first ecclesiastical patron in Rome was Cardinal Carlo Colonna, and that, while a guest at his palace, the Casa Colonna, he was commissioned to compose this fine service in our Lady's honour, as his first task in the Eternal City.

There remain a few loose ends to be cleared up. A five-part Mass by Handel ought to be a joy for any Catholic choir to sing. This *Kyrie* and *Gloria* are not. Although the manuscript is undoubtedly in Handel's writing, the style is that of the late polyphonic music of the previous century and in places several string parts are written on the same stave. This is not Handel's usual practice, and, with Chrysander, I believe this to be a copy of another composer's work. Barclay Squire noted that it was not one of Habermann's Masses, but it is very similar in style and outline to a five-part Mass composed by G. P. Colonna (1640-95) whom Grove's *Dictionary* describes as 'amongst the most distinguished Italians of his century'. If we assume a probable relationship to the Colonna family in Rome there is ample reason for Handel to have made a copy or a special study of his technique. It is also not unreasonable to think that G. P. Colonna's music provided the accompaniment for the 'grand Mass' on the morning of 16 July 1707, and that some grand and uncommon Vespers set by Mr Handel graced the afternoon and evening of the same day.

Chrysander believed that the motet *Silete Venti* belonged to a later Handel period, possibly about 1715-20. If we extend this period by a few more years an attractive musical clue becomes evident. For the long *Alleluia* is an extended version of that used for *Seuiat tellus* and may well have been intended as a compliment to Cardinal Colonna, as it could not fail to recall the triumph of the first *Alleluia*, written for him twenty years before.

The debatable *Magnificat* and *Te Deum*, both typically Handelian in their musical character and both freely used later to adorn *Israel in Egypt* and other works, may or may not have had their place in these unforgettable Vespers of our Lady sung on 16 July 1707. But the place for them is there. It was seriously suggested by a good Handelian in 1908 that Erba and Urio may not be the rather undistinguished composers to whom these works have been later attributed, but perhaps were the beautiful towns in Northern Italy in which Mr Handel wrote them.

A last remark may be made in all sincerity. Really fine Catholic music is not so plentiful that we can afford to ignore its existence. The larger part of Handel's Latin Church Music is now available in a practical form. It is high time the Carmelites heard their Vespers again.

CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN FRANCE

By GERMAIN BRULLIARD¹

This article continues the series of studies of the practical problems of Catholic higher education in various countries which began in the last number of THE DUBLIN REVIEW with articles about the position in Germany and Austria.

Explaining that in theory the French State still retains the monopoly of higher education that Napoleon gave it, and that the five Catholic universities of France are strictly speaking not legally entitled to be described as universities, M. Brulliard goes on to examine in candid fashion the problems and the academic standing of those five universities today, and, while making his own opinions clear, describes the controversy among Catholics with regard to their future.

BEFORE the French Revolution the universities of France were independent and were in general guided by the Church. They were eventually suppressed by the *Convention* under a law passed on 20 March 1794. It was Napoleon who, in education as in so many other spheres, restored the institutions necessary to the ordered life of the country; but with the Imperial University the State monopoly in education was established. This was in line with the imperial despotism, but also with the conception, dear to the Revolution, of a single system of education for all children of the fatherland. 'Above all,' declared Napoleon, 'we must achieve unity, and a complete generation must be cast in the same mould.' Somewhat later, on 25 February 1817, Royer-Collard noted that the university 'is nothing less than the Government applying

¹ The writer is a professor at the Institut Catholique in Paris.

itself to the task of the universal direction of public instruction. The fundamental principle on which the university is built is that public instruction and education are the province of the State.'

History was to show that this creation of a single State university was harmful to France in general and to French Catholics in particular. First, it contributed to the impoverishment of the French provinces, whose cultural centres declined in importance as the influence of those in Paris increased. More serious still, the Imperial University of France was to become, because of its totalitarian character, a formidable weapon against the Catholic Church and her doctrine. It also exacerbated the quarrel between the advocates and the adversaries of Christian education to such a degree that the political and social life of France has been poisoned from the beginning of the nineteenth century right up to the present day.

The Imperial University was established, it is true, in a spirit more of indifference than of open hostility to the Church. After the fall of the Empire there came a period when the influence of the Church was sufficiently strong for her to be able to accept the State University; but soon her opponents, heirs of the anti-clerical and anti-religious ideas of the Revolution, came to power, and the Church experienced the need to organize her own system. It should have been possible to establish it in justice, understanding and harmony, but unfortunately this did not happen. Only by hard and painful struggle was the Church able to extract legislation permitting her to organize, cost what it might, a system of Catholic education. She has not yet succeeded in obtaining for herself a consistent, satisfactory and stable position in education. Throughout the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth she had to struggle with resolute enemies who managed little by little to build up under the name of secularism nothing short of an anti-religion. Like so many other expressions denoting a developing tendency rather than a clear idea, this *laïcité* is difficult to define in precise terms. However, historically and in the field of education, it has meant and it still generally means today a materialistic and atheistic conception of society which its exponents strive to realize in practice, and one so opposed to that of the Catholic Church that it has always implied an attempt to eliminate the Church completely.

The Sorbonne was not a whit behind elementary education in this struggle, and one of its most eminent authorities, M.

certain lack of balance in French political life, the opposing forces coming on top each in turn but neither being strong enough to enforce a final solution. That is why, when the exponents of the secularist State were in office, they did not in general turn to a policy of outright suppression but attacked details in the system of independent education, hoping by this means to create for the various institutions difficulties that would indirectly involve at least their weakening, if not their ultimate disappearance.

Two further reasons can be found for the survival of the independent system. Since the beginning of the present century, more and more Catholics have made a career for themselves in public education. Secondly, the movements of population brought about by the two world wars have also had an effect. Memories of trials suffered in common have certainly helped to reduce the tension.

We must now examine the means used to establish the Church's system of independent education in France. Catholics claimed the freedom of higher education as well as of secondary and elementary education, but while the latter were granted by the *Loi Falloux* of 15 March 1850 they had to wait much longer for higher education. Provision for this was made in 1875 by the short-lived liberal republic that followed the Franco-Prussian war. Some months later, general elections brought the advocates of a secularist, atheistic republic to power. They set about diminishing the effect of the recent reform, and in 1880 an amending act was passed that was unfavourable to Catholics. The texts of the laws of 1875 and 1880 still provide the charter of independent higher education.

Section 1 of the 1875 law is concerned in general with the courses of study and institutions of independent higher education. It proclaims that higher education is free. Articles 2, 3 and 4 lay down in a very liberal spirit the conditions for the opening and running of these establishments. Article 5—an important one—enacts that these establishments

... whether belonging to individuals or to associations, may describe themselves as independent faculties of letters, sciences, law, medicine, etc., provided they number on their staffs as many professors entitled to the degree of doctor as the smallest of the State University faculties. When they include up to three faculties they are entitled to describe themselves as independent universities.

Aulard, laid down a rule of conduct in the *Annales de la Jeunesse laïque*.

We cannot claim that we are not out to destroy religion [he wrote]. That would mean renouncing on behalf of the beliefs we profess the right common to all beliefs proclaiming themselves to be the truth, of suppressing the opposing doctrine which they hold to be error. Indeed, it is not just a right; it is a duty. We should proclaim, therefore, that we wish to destroy religion.

The secularist outlook thus involves the conception of a certain type of materialist, atheistic and socialist republic. But how can such a republic be created except by monopolizing the education of the rising generation and divorcing it from the influence of family and Church? We may well ask how in such circumstances Catholics were able to establish and keep in being an independent system of higher education. There are several possible explanations, each of which is at least partly valid.

Nations, like many of the individuals composing them, are subject to internal contradictions and they manage to assimilate them provided they are not too sharp. Under the Revolution, whose principles are so constantly evoked in France, there were in fact a number of different currents. One of them, intolerant, sectarian and authoritarian, led to the idea of a materialistic and atheistic republic striving to enforce its will on the citizens in order to ensure their happiness, even if it was not the kind of happiness they themselves sought. But there was also a strong tendency towards a more authentic liberalism, which found at least partial expression in the Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1789-91. Article 10 laid down in particular that 'no-one should be disturbed for his opinions, even religious', and Article 11 declared: 'Freedom to communicate thoughts and opinions is one of the most precious of man's rights.'

The advocates of a secularist State were certainly embarrassed by this contradiction when it became too obvious, and it prevented them from applying to independent education the radical treatment they would have liked to apply to it. Moreover, if the secularist attitude predominated in the university, it was not the same in other sectors of national life. Catholics themselves were an important element in the population, and the secularist spirit never had any impact on the true liberals. The result has been a

Article 4 forbids establishments of independent higher education to take the title of university. In a second paragraph it further lays down that 'No diplomas which it is decided to grant to students may be described as *baccalauréats*, *licences* or *doctorats*'. Article 5, taking up in another way the provision already contained in Article 1, enacts that:

University titles and degrees can be granted only to those who have obtained them after the regular examinations and competitive examinations undertaken before professors or examiners of the State University.

The text of the law of 1875 itself shows how difficult it was for the legislator, full of goodwill though he may have been, to get away from the idea of a single, imperial State University, so strongly had this imposed itself upon French opinion.

Taking France's special difficulties into account, however, the law of 1875 must be regarded as a great success for the supporters of freedom in education. They were fully satisfied, and amid great enthusiasm the five Catholic universities of Paris, Lyons, Angers, Lille and Toulouse were immediately founded. Were there too many? This has been claimed since, but the law of 1875 in its original text certainly justified great hopes, even if these were unfortunately to be dashed by the law of 1880.

The elimination of the system of special examiners and the restriction to the State University of the sole right of conferring matriculation, *licences*, and doctorates—the qualifications which open the way to careers—was a great handicap to the universities which had hardly opened and which were then forced to develop under a regime that can without exaggeration be described as one of petty persecution.

The five we have mentioned are the only independent universities in France, in the sense that they alone have three faculties. The law of 1880 having deprived them of the title of university, this was in most cases replaced by that of *Institut*, although those at Lille and Lyons preferred to be described as Catholic faculties. That at Angers has in fact again adopted the name of university.

Each of the Catholic universities is self-governing, and each has its special features. The Paris *Institut Catholique* comprises six faculties: those of theology, canon law, philosophy, law, letters and natural sciences. To be complete it would also need a faculty

Section 3, which deals with the conferment of degrees, is particularly important, covering Articles 13, 14 and 15 of the law. Article 13 stipulates that the pupils of the independent faculties may present themselves for examination by the examiners of the State faculties on giving proof that they have kept the terms and studied the subjects prescribed by the regulations:

Pupils of the free universities can also elect, should they wish, to go before special examiners, as laid down in Article 14. . . .

Article 14 prescribes that:

the special examiners are to be chosen from among the professors of the State University or from other members having passed the State *agrégation* examination, and from the professors of the independent universities. These examiners, who must all be doctors, will be drawn where possible in equal numbers from the State faculties and the independent university from which the candidates come. If, however, they make up an odd number, the majority will go to the representatives of State education, from among whom, in each case, the chairman of the examiners will be drawn.

Finally, Article 15 lays it down that:

students of the independent universities will be governed by the same rules as those governing the State faculties, particularly in regard to the requirements of age, matriculation, registration and duration of studies.

Section 4, the last in the law of 1875, stipulates the penalties for breaches of the regulations.

To this law that of 1880 makes certain amendments. The second paragraph of Article 5 and Articles 13, 14 and 15, already referred to, are suppressed. Instead Article 1 of the law of 1880 stipulates that:

The examinations and practical tests governing the conferment of degrees can be taken only before examiners from the State University.

According to Article 2:

All candidates are subject to the same regulations governing syllabuses, educational level and mode of matriculation.

studies. Particularly worth mentioning are the Schools of Agriculture and Viticulture, the Training College for Social Studies, the courses in household and family management, and two higher technical schools for chemistry and electronics.

The Catholic Institute at Toulouse is made up of three canonical faculties—those of theology, canon law and philosophy—to which is added a faculty of letters. This Institute also contains a Higher School of Science and dependent schools, a School of Agriculture, a School of Economic and Social Sciences, and a School of Kindergarten Teachers.

When we come to examine the achievements of all these institutions it is not easy to draw conclusions. Undoubted successes have been obtained, and efforts have been made that deserve due recognition, even if they have not met with a fair reward. Nevertheless, we must not be afraid of the truth, and must be on our guard against optimistic illusions that might hide it. The Catholic universities have undoubtedly shown real vitality, and in the main they have succeeded in providing the Catholic intellectual centres aimed at by their founders. They have made a great contribution to the Catholic revival, which has made itself felt since the end of the last century; and we should not underestimate the influence they have exercised through the prestige and activities of their rectors and professors. They have, as we have seen, led to the foundation of a number of associated schools and institutes that have also done good work in their own specialist domains. Here, however, we come to a rather delicate question. These schools and institutes certainly fill a need and have done good work, but it must be added that they are very unequal in their attainments. If some are really complementary to the faculties, others, even though they may enjoy a good reputation, are no more than examples of what is termed in modern parlance technical higher education. Whatever may be the value of technical education, it is never more than a training in applied science, and does not help in the analysis of fundamental knowledge; it is *not* a form of higher education. Some of the institutions, indeed, do not go beyond the level of elementary technical education. Thus, it is only by studying the position of the principal establishments in our Catholic universities—that is, the actual faculties—that we can judge whether a real system of Catholic higher education has been established or not, and whether the results achieved are satisfactory.

of medicine and pharmacy. The first three faculties—those of theology, canon law and philosophy—were canonically instituted by the Holy See in 1889. They are governed by the Apostolic Constitution *Deus Scientiarum* (24 May 1931), and by the regulations prescribed by the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities (22 June 1931). They are entitled to confer the degrees of bachelor, licentiate and doctor on the same terms as the pontifical Roman universities.

Around this strictly university nucleus a number of institutes and schools have been created which fall mainly into the category of what is today termed higher technical education. Among the best known of these are the Institute of Social Studies, Ethnology and Religious Sociology; the Gregorian Institute; the School of Psychiatry, the Higher Institutes of Interpretation and Translation; the School of Librarianship; the Higher Institute of Electronics; the School of Mineral and Organic Chemistry, the Centre for the Study of Legal Practice and Business Administration; and, most important of all, the Higher School of Economic and Commercial Science, which is one of the best centres of higher commercial study in France.

At Lille there are five Catholic faculties—those of theology, law, medicine and pharmacy, letters and natural sciences. Around these faculties are grouped sixteen institutes or higher schools, particularly noteworthy being a Higher Institute of Religious Teaching, a Higher School of Industrial Studies, a very interesting Higher School of Journalism, an Institute of Accountancy, and schools for nurses, midwives, women teachers and women group leaders. Finally there is an Institute of Russian Studies.

At Lyons there are six Catholic faculties—those of theology, canon law, philosophy, law, letters and natural sciences. They are reinforced by institutes and schools, among which are the Institutes of Sociology and Pedagogy, a School of Legal Practice, and a very unusual course designed to prepare students for Cambridge degrees, an introductory French course for foreigners, an Institute of Romance Languages, an Institute of Industrial Chemistry with a physics and electronics section, a School of Practical Biochemistry, an Institute of Research into Leprosy, and research laboratories of recognized value.

The Catholic University of the West, at Angers, has four faculties, those of theology, law, letters, and natural sciences, together with eight higher schools and three centres of higher

establishing higher education in the canonical studies, in other fields she has succeeded in doing so only occasionally and sporadically.

Two major causes are responsible for checking progress in independent higher education in the faculties of letters, natural sciences, law and medicine. The second is in some degree the consequence of the first. These causes are the persecution and injustice established by the law of 1880, and economic and financial difficulties. One of the changes made by the law of 1880 is of overriding importance. This is that which relates to the conferment of degrees. In a country such as France where administrative careers of any importance, the liberal professions and many private posts are open only to those with degrees recognized by the State, no real university can be created if it is not given the right to examine and to grant certificates enabling candidates to receive these degrees. The legislator of 1875 had somewhat timidly recognized this right by the provision that the students in the independent universities could sit for their examinations before special examiners drawn partly from the independent university and partly from the State University. This system, although it might be found surprisingly deficient to those used to real freedom of education, would probably have left the Catholic faculties with sufficient prestige and authority in the eyes of their students to allow them to develop. But Articles 13, 14 and 15 of the law of 1880 changed that by insisting that the State alone had the right to grant degrees and that the conduct of examinations must be the province of the State faculties. Under these conditions, freedom of education, which, it was claimed, had been respected, became nothing but a fraud. How could one expect that students anxious to safeguard their future would follow courses in the independent faculties when afterwards they had to submit themselves to examiners in the State faculties who were not their own professors? They would be even less inclined to do so since the supremacy in the matter of examinations given to the State University extended also to the syllabuses. Admittedly the teaching in the State University must be in conformity with the published syllabuses, but the State professors decide the aspects to which they will give special attention. This is particularly true of the courses on elementary principles intended for law students. At the end of the year the subjects for examination are taken from these State courses. How can we be surprised if Catholic students and their parents are

The erection of the canonical faculties seems to have been a great success. They have provided a more enlightened clergy, and have helped to bring an awareness of the excellent work done by the teaching staff and their pupils. The most there is to complain of is a shortage of pupils, particularly in the canon law faculties. This is due to the lack of priests and the Church's need to entrust the young priests with tasks that do not always allow them to continue their studies. In general, the teaching given in these canonical faculties is considered of high standard—so much so that they can be said to have made their mark alongside the State universities. Nowadays even among the most determined exponents of secularized instruction there is no longer any question of suppressing the higher education given by the canonical faculties.

But what of the faculties dealing with secular learning? Their importance is appreciated when we realize how limited and specialized is the sphere of the canonical faculties. If the Church wishes to specify and spread her own doctrine, in opposition to doctrines to which she objects, she can best attain this objective through the fundamental knowledge studied in the faculties of science, letters, law and medicine. But in that case the training given must be authoritative and of high quality. And we must admit that this aim has not been achieved. True, the Catholic universities have counted and still count some eminent names that the French scientific world unites to honour. We might mention those of Branly, who held the chair of general physics in the Catholic Institute at Paris, and of Père Sertillanges and M. Jacques Maritain, who taught philosophy there. Recently, too, students in the Faculty of Letters in the State University have been coming in considerable numbers to follow the courses in French literature given by Monsignor Calvet. But these are exceptions. It must be conceded that normally the teaching is not authoritative, that pupils are not generally taken as far as the doctorate which is the real crown of higher studies, and that only rarely is academic work completed wholly within the Catholic faculties.

If we consider them as schools these institutions are good. The successes of their students in the State examinations are satisfactory, and they show the capability and devotion of the professors who work under particularly difficult conditions and would often be better off as assistants in the State University.

In general, then, while the Church has really succeeded in

a gross total of 42,000 francs. Indeed, he is less well paid than a maid-of-all-work, who gets from 30,000 to 35,000 francs plus her keep. It is understandable, therefore, that the professor in the Catholic faculty has to devote a great part, if not the greater part, of his work to trying to earn a living elsewhere. The result is that he gets farther away from the role of a real university professor and is more ready to accept the status of assistant, to which his unfair legal position tends to reduce him. How can he find the time to prepare his lectures properly, to undertake research, to publish, to follow the development of his students and to direct their work?

Apart from salaries, however, the independent universities have to find the money for the building and equipment of libraries and laboratories. In the near future, in fact, the free universities will have to find a way out of their financial difficulties if they are not to perish, or at least to deteriorate.

After these two major causes of difficulty we must turn to a minor one if we are to avoid the risk of being accused of leaving it out altogether. The law of 1880, as we have seen, deprived the Catholic universities of the right to use the word 'university' in their title, but it is only since 1896 that a group of three State faculties has been able to describe itself as a university. The question is therefore open to revision. We have also noticed that the Catholic Institute at Angers was not afraid to take back its old title. It can thus be seen that the State does not bother over-much about a question of words. What matters is not whether an institution is called a university, but whether, under this preferential title or any other, it has faculties worthy of the name.

While the reasons for the weakness of the Catholic universities are very evident, it is still not easy to see how it can be remedied.

Some people considering themselves realists suggest as a solution that the Catholic universities, having once shown their capacity, should retain their canonical faculties, their institutes and associated colleges that are working well, but should give up the secular faculties that are working badly and that they cannot maintain properly through lack of money. To the objection that such a reform would mean doing away with an essential part of what constitutes, or should constitute, higher Catholic education, they reply that the State University has changed, that many Catholics are now professors in it, and that there is no longer the old sectarian bias. We must hope that these realists—among

generally persuaded that it is necessary to follow the lectures at the State University if one is to have any chance of success?

The independent faculties have nevertheless survived, though with far fewer students than the corresponding State ones; and they have also had to take account of the circumstances. Their professors have had to be ready to keep abreast of the teaching given in the State faculties and to pass on the information to their students so that they will be properly fitted for their State examinations. In other words, as we have just said, our faculties have had to resign themselves to becoming schools and centres of preparation for the official examination. In our view the system laid down by the law of 1880, with its return to the totalitarianism of the State University, made this development inevitable once there was any question of retaining classical university teaching and a reasonable number of students. Would it have been better to have abandoned this approach, organizing authoritative courses of lectures on the principles of law, literature and the sciences? But who would have given them, and who would have followed the courses? Probably, in spite of the *deminutio capitis* which they have had to suffer, the independent faculties have done more as they are, and have had a greater influence, than could have been expected from such courses.

Let us now turn to the financial question. Up to the present the independent universities have had to depend exclusively on the understanding and generosity of their friends, and before the 1914 war these resources already seemed insufficient. They have gone on diminishing steadily ever since, as the area of State control has increased and as private fortunes have contracted. At the same time expenses and needs have gone on increasing. It is no exaggeration to say that at the present time they have reached a real crisis.

The consequences of this lack of proper finance are serious. First, the universities are not able to provide their professors with the salaries necessary to enable them to furnish the time and effort necessary for their work. The gap between the salary of the State professor, who even so complains of insufficient reward, and that of the professor in independent higher education has become tremendous. To give one example, a professor in a State University after twenty-five years of teaching receives a monthly salary which with various allowances amounts to 200,000 francs. Under the same conditions, his colleague in the independent faculty receives

Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1789-91, it has been repeated in the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man (Article 26) and in the European Declaration. A majority of the authors of French public law hold that these declarations should be included among the fundamental principles on which French society is considered to be built, and that they are mandatory on Governments wishing to act in conformity with the ideal of a free democracy. While the State may feel it incumbent to create a public service to ensure education, to allow this service to lead to the disappearance of independent education would be an abuse amounting to totalitarianism.

A useful study on this subject is the well thought-out and documented report presented by the assistant General Secretary of the Catholic organization for independent education, Canon Kerlevoe, to a congress which met at Poitiers in April 1955 to consider the contribution Catholic education had to offer to the national life. There is today a strong current of opinion in favour of independent education, as three of the opinions quoted by Canon Kerlevoe will show.

According to M. Rivero, professor at the law faculty in Paris, 'secularism has become a juridical idea after having been above all a matter of political passion. . . . If real secularism means a doctrine adopted and taught officially, the State responsible for it *ipso facto* decides against the liberal order in favour of the totalitarian order'.¹ The same attenuated idea of secularism can be found in this remark of M. A. Marie, a former Minister of Education: 'Secularism is not just a metaphysical point of view, it is not just a system which aims at replacing some other system, even less is it a tool of partisan passions. It is respect for man, for the integrity of his spiritual life and for the many facets of truth.'² We are thus very far from the partisan declarations of the beginning of the century. But if secularism loses its hostility to become neutral and even benevolent, the need for Catholic education remains. M. Waline, also a professor in the Paris law faculty, pertinently criticizes the idea that, 'with the State school open to everyone, the Catholic school is no longer needed'. 'There is a double error in this,' he says. 'The State school, once it has been proclaimed secular, is no longer, and has never been, open to Catholic families. Secularism was proclaimed to preserve the freedom of conscience

¹ *J.D.H.*, 1949, p. 137.

² *Ed. Nat.*, No. 22, 26 June 1952.

whom it is discouraging to find a large number of priests—have taken into account the consequences of such an abdication, and that they are not making their suggestion lightly. Nevertheless it is hard to avoid a very different conclusion when we examine the background of the problem ourselves.

It is indeed true that the State University has changed for the better since the First World War. The secularist spirit is considerably less marked, and the cause of independent education has often found its most persuasive advocates among the professors in the State system. But let us look at the matter more closely. When a Catholic professor teaches in the State University he must observe strict neutrality, whereas the professor in the Catholic faculty can affirm the Church's teaching. Supposing the State professor is able to hint discreetly at his personal opinion, will he be understood by his pupils? Again, is there not a danger that one of his colleagues will hint no less discreetly at an entirely opposite point of view on the same subject? If a pupil finds himself in the class of this second professor, will he have the necessary critical faculty? It does not seem as though the presence of Catholics in the State University either gives the Church a real forum or provides the students with the necessary guarantees. Unfortunately, some Catholic State professors have persuaded themselves that their presence is enough to give the Church the safeguards she needs. They therefore adopt a kind of neo-secularist attitude, less crude in its exterior manifestations than the old but tending nevertheless to bring about the disappearance of the Catholic faculties dealing with secular subjects. It would be a good thing if the Catholic body as a whole came to appreciate that agreement to such an abdication would gratuitously provide the State University with the very situation counted upon and prepared by the legislator of 1880.

If the faculties of letters, science, law and medicine are to be suppressed this would be a surrender based on despair, and it would leave out of account the main reason for founding a Catholic University system. Such a surrender does not, for the moment at least, seem at all necessary. On the contrary, there are good grounds for hoping that the status and condition of free higher education will be improved, perhaps quite soon. One reason for encouragement is the fact that the principle of freedom of education has not only been maintained but is finding more and more supporters in influential circles. Contained implicitly in the

danger, if it is given by a single agency, even though it be the State, of losing itself in an arbitrarily chosen course. Many writers have taken up and developed the same ideas today. One of the best qualified among them, for instance, M. Burdeau, also a professor of law in Paris, has this to say: 'Private teaching means in practice teaching in confessional schools, whose monopoly would be just as intolerable from the point of view of liberty as that of the State. . . . Perhaps, between the official education and the private schools, rivalry will replace hostility. . . .'

Now that the case for free education is so well understood by leading thinkers, what are the chances of a rapid improvement in the situation? The political climate in France seems to open the way for a real and lasting reform. The present Government feels this, and the Prime Minister, M. Debré, has announced his intention of solving the problem in such an atmosphere and under such conditions that the settlement arrived at will not reopen quarrels from which the country has already suffered too much. This settlement must be arrived at 'in such a way that it will be final and will be considered as such by all men of good will'.¹

To what measures can we look forward in the field of higher education? The situation is too uncertain for it to be easy to hazard any guesses. Nevertheless, in our opinion, and in the light of what we have already said, there is one reform which should take precedence over the others, because on it depends the continued existence or the disappearance of real independent higher education. This is the right of conferring university degrees. As long as the free faculties do not have the right to organize examinations and furnish certificates allowing their students to receive the official diplomas of *baccalauréat*, *licence* and doctorate, they cannot be regarded as real institutions of higher education.

The present period is one for hope and not for surrender. May the vigilance and efforts of all those who have fought in the good cause of independent education be at last rewarded. May that Catholic higher education of which we were given a fleeting glimpse between 1875 and 1880 become, for the greater good of France, a living reality.

¹ Investiture address, 16 January 1959.

of fathers of families who were atheists or unbelievers, but the legislator did not realize, or acted as though he did not realize, that by the same stroke he sacrificed the freedom of conscience of all the other families.' Moreover, there may not have been quite the change in the attitude to independent education that these quotations would lead us to believe. Unfortunately it has not been entirely taken out of politics or cleansed of all sectarian passion, even though there has undoubtedly been a great improvement.

Those principally responsible for framing French public law have not restricted themselves to putting forward the principles they consider just and undeniable; very conscious of the material difficulties in the way of independent education, they are looking for methods of allowing it to go on existing and fulfilling its role. More and more people are coming to recognize that independent education performs 'a private service in the public interest'. But since the public interest is in question, the State should, logically, come to the aid of independent education. This help could take the form of subsidies granted to families, which would thus cease to be subject to taxes allocated for public education while they were laying out in another direction the considerable sums that the private establishments are forced to demand from them for the education of their children. Subsidies could also be granted directly to the establishments themselves once they are recognized to be performing a public service. Such a system of direct aid would doubtless be a more normal way of providing for the free universities.

There is a third consideration in the context of which we can quote a number of encouraging opinions. More and more people are coming to believe that good independent education would be an advantage and an intellectual enrichment for France. Even under the Revolution most writers were opposed to a State monopoly in education. 'The interests of the Republic of Letters and those, of course, of the State require that education should not be solely in the hands of one body,' wrote La Chalotais. The *rapporteur* of the *Loi Falloux*, M. Beugnot, had some wise things to say which have not lost their point today. 'The State is going to find itself in competition with the citizens. That competition, which will chiefly take the form of emulation, will be an excellent way of preserving the University from the temptation of its old pride.' Among the beneficial effects of freedom is the improvement of public instruction, threatened by uniformity and by the

A LETTER FROM PARIS

FRENCH Catholics have given rise to a great deal of talk about themselves in recent years. There has been admiration for the novelty of their experiments, alarm at their excesses, and vexation at the publicity they have been given. It is important to understand why they have had to look for new ways and new methods.

Nearly all the French are still baptized into the Catholic Church, and yet a minority of only 22 or 25 per cent practise their faith regularly. In some country districts, such as Brittany or the eastern part of central France, 90 per cent of the villagers go to Mass and perform their Easter duties; in others, such as Champagne and the western part of the central region, the practice of the faith is very weak, and sometimes whole villages have almost entirely lost it. The industrial working classes are for the most part not only cut off from all contact with the Church, but have even lost all sense of religion. This is much more serious, and calls for a special kind of pastoral activity, adapted to the needs of both adults and children.

Specialized forms of Catholic action and the researches of religious sociology have freed French Catholics from many illusions and brought them to see things as they are. They want to know the causes of the falling off in the practice of the faith and the weakening of the Christian spirit, and the remedies for this as well. It has needed clear thinking and courage; Pius XII remarked upon this clarity of thought and courage as among the characteristics of present-day French Catholicism when he gave an audience to the pilgrims who had come to Rome for the ceremony in which Cardinals Feltrin and Grente received their Red Hats in 1953.

In a church we can obviously count those who are present. But those many who never come to it are even more in our minds. This clear view of the situation, far from leading to discouragement, has brought a deepening of the personal Christian life of the faithful, a greater sense of solidarity, and a new apostolic zeal to both laity and clergy. It is true that this apostolic spirit has not so far brought crowds flocking to the churches, and some people, therefore, are already beginning to question the value of the means employed and to work out new methods of their own which they think will be undoubtedly more successful. This power of continual re-adaption is one of the surest indications of the spiritual vitality of France, although at the same time it can lead to instability and exaggerated notions, sometimes to impatience and disorder. Nevertheless, an undeniable result has been

achieved, and one which bears sound promise for the future, in the formation of a generation of young Catholics, and especially of young Catholic families, who not only take their faith very seriously but, as part of that faith, take seriously the duty of sharing it with others.

In each country Catholicism has its special characteristics. Perhaps the most striking mark of French Catholicism during these last years has been its missionary spirit. It has often been said that the entire Church in France must be considered as missionary. What is meant by this? It implies, first of all, an awareness that there are so many people who neither know nor love Christ and His Church, and that it is necessary to break with old ways which, on pretext of keeping and preserving the faith, have in fact failed to prevent the loss of the majority to the Church. Then it implies a 'presence' and great adaptability. The missionary is in the midst of those to whom he is to bring the gospel, and he must adapt himself to their ways and to their culture; he must learn to present the mysteries of the faith in a new language. It might be added that French Catholicism is a Catholicism deeply rooted in the concrete realities of life. It brings its action to bear in those very spheres where men have lost their faith, or are in danger of losing it. It seeks to solve the real and concrete problems which they face, however complicated these may be. But there is a third characteristic which recent events have tended to stress—one which has both advantages and drawbacks. It is that French Catholicism—or rather French Catholics—forms no political bloc. This is allied to the problem of the position of French Catholicism in the nation as a whole and in relation to the State.

It goes without saying that French Catholics are united in their faith, in the sacraments and in the hierarchy. But in other spheres it is freedom—one might almost, on occasions, say complete anarchy—which reigns. French Catholics claim freedom of choice in politics; in fact they all too easily press that freedom to the point where it becomes valueless. This division of forces, the splitting of the Catholic contribution between several parties, destroys what might be a powerful influence. The sword which we might successfully wield on behalf of our freedom and our rights is often rendered powerless. There is no large-scale, coherent civil activity inspired by Christian ideals on a nationwide scale. Among political parties which seek the votes of Catholics there are bitter rivalries which are often turned to the advantage of the enemies of the Church. The drawbacks, then, are obvious. Nevertheless, those who are qualified to judge think that the time is not ripe for the political unity of Catholics. They maintain that if this means action under pressure from Hierarchy, and the formation of an organized political party, it is not even desirable.

There would seem to be two reasons for the lack of political unity among French Catholics: a desire to break, sometimes ruthlessly, with

be said. The policy which France is at present pursuing in Algeria has many reasons behind it, including the need to protect a minority which is not an unjust aggressor, to arbitrate between rival factions which shrink before no excesses, to maintain a balance on which the peace of the Mediterranean depends, and to exploit an under-developed country which possesses great resources. France has then sufficient reasons for her action to demonstrate the justice of her cause. But that cause would be in danger of becoming unjust if she should have recourse to reprisals or arbitrary action, or if through weakness or neglect she should fail to find an answer to the problem, and one that will satisfy the legitimate desires of the majority. The position of the Church in this conflict is difficult. The Bishops and French Catholics cannot cut themselves off from the nation; at the same time they cannot compromise the already precarious position of the Catholic Church in the world of the Mohammedans, who also have the right to the faith and to baptism. So the Catholic belongs to two worlds. This double loyalty can sometimes be heart-rending, but it calls for a view of these problems from a higher level, above the conflict. In this way it is possible to find just and true solutions, as Mgr Lefevre, the Archbishop of Rabat, has shown. Episcopal intervention in North Africa has not been intended to provide any comprehensive solutions, but only to set forth the demands of Christian morality at the level of means, methods and ends. Several years ago a collection of episcopal documents was published in a book entitled *Le drame de l'Afrique du Nord et la conscience Chrétienne*. The Hierarchy recall the duty of respect for the moral dignity and physical integrity of man, they condemn racial hatred, reprisals and cruelty, and they hold the view that new solutions must be found at the political level which will allow two peoples of such difference of race, language, culture and religion to live together.

The religious problems arising from the prolonging of the war and of military service include the dislocation of Catholic action throughout metropolitan France, the presence in Africa of 2,500 seminarists on active service (Cardinal Feltin, Chaplain-General to the Army, expressed at the beginning of Lent his disquiet on the subject of the religious and moral problems of soldiers, especially of those in Algeria); and the use of psychological methods by the army. In the early days of the rebellion, the question of torture was anxiously raised; during recent months there has been frequent discussion about psychological methods evolved and used by the army in the light of experience gained in the world war and in Viet Nam as a technique for meeting subversive and revolutionary war.

Political problems do not distract the Church's attention from social questions, which she follows very closely. There have been several interventions of the Hierarchy lately; for instance, over the strike in the North of France, and again, on 1 March this year, over the threat of

the politics of the past, and the efforts of a rearguard to keep that past alive. It may be said that many French Catholics are facing a moment of crisis or of flight. They are changing, and are looking for 'new lands'.

Politically, French Catholics are divided on many issues, and the Catholic Press reflects this diversity of opinion. Difference of opinion is normal, healthy and beneficial, but it can lead to trouble when passions are roused and when opinions become intolerant. Some of our journalists have taken up a too inflexible attitude. They abuse each other over the heads of the poor Catholic population, which is stunned and sometimes scandalized and does not understand much about these conflicts. *Intégrisme* and *progressisme* are the accusations most frequently bandied about. There are pamphleteers on the one hand who feel that they have a mission to serve as a sort of doctrinal police. In every work of theological research and in every development in pastoral theology they detect disobedience to the Church; they are more than suspicious of attempts to put into practice the social teaching of the Church. There are also publications, on the other hand, which show a naïve sympathy with the social and economic experiments of the Communists. These have systematically opposed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European movement. They have gone further in the attack on capitalism, the West and Christian civilization. The intellectuals responsible for most of these pamphlets repudiate Marxist metaphysics, but in practice find their readers among those who give their votes to the Communist party, or to left-wing groups which support the Communists. The deviations of some and the propaganda of others have led to the belief, outside France, that most of the French Catholic Press has been suffering from 'red fever', and that newspapers sold outside the churches after Mass on Sundays are mostly left-wing newspapers more or less openly in revolt against the Church.

A bitter argument, sometimes violent, has lately arisen over the so-called anti-national attitude of certain of these newspapers. It may be that in some Catholic circles national interests are too easily equated with the highest Christian values, whereas in others there is a tendency to neglect the national interests altogether. Certain periodicals have sometimes been lacking in patriotism, representing France as nearly always in the wrong and to blame for the difficulties which she has encountered for many years now in her relations with the coloured peoples of Asia and Africa. It is not astonishing that on this subject the division of opinion is deep. One of the most difficult questions of the present time is that of the development and political emancipation of the African people, as much in North Africa as in Negro Africa. What is the Catholic attitude to these demands, which daily become more imperious? The Algerian war, which entered its fifth year last November, is the most tragic expression of the problem. I think this much can

MR TILLOTSON AND MR POPE

By J. M. CAMERON

NEVER before can there have been so many excellent critics writing in English. If it is hard to be sure that Mr Eliot, say, and Dr Leavis are critics of quite the stature of Johnson and Arnold—we are perhaps as yet in no position to judge—the sheer mass of critical work of high quality is all the same impressive. There are what may be called the scholarly critics, those who excel both in the business of establishing and annotating texts and in the analysis and interpretation of the texts. Here I have in mind such scholars as C. S. Lewis, Bonamy Dobrée, Geoffrey Tillotson, John Butt, James Sutherland, to name only a few. Again, we live in a culture which has in a sense rediscovered the theory and the art of criticism, after a period in the doldrums at the end of the nineteenth century and in the first two decades of this. For this rediscovery many critics have been responsible, notably, as well as Eliot and Leavis, Robert Graves and Laura Riding, I. A. Richards, William Empson and Wilson Knight. Then there are those critics who make their point by relating literature to other subject matters, to politics, psychology, natural science and so on. Here the most distinguished work has been done by two Americans, Edmund Wilson and Lionel Trilling. But to mention America suggests a host of other fine critics who are well known and influential here: Wimsatt, Cleanth Brooks, Allen Tate, R. P. Blackmur, Northrop Frye, Fr Walter Ong and many others.

With all these riches we ought to be happy. But are we? Of course, it is in the nature of the critical pursuit that there should be strong disagreements between critics. Those who are no more than middle-aged have lived through a revolution in the methods of criticism and have seen the balance of taste quite reversed. It is not extravagant to say that we have been given a new Shakespeare, that such writers as Donne and Marvell who were hard to read a generation ago are now available on easy terms to the ordinary cultivated reader, that poets and novelists who not so long ago were neglected or derided—Hopkins, Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, Henry James—are now the staple of academic criticism. And there are already signs of a further shift. The eighteenth century is going up and the seventeenth perhaps a little down, new dimensions of the romantics are being explored, the market for Tennyson may be a

unemployment. (This threat was on a small scale compared with the position in other countries; France had no more than 44,300 unemployed receiving assistance at that time.) The employers of the North held that the religious authority, in intervening, did not sufficiently take into account the concrete circumstances in an industry which, although it had not been able to foresee the future, had at least never chosen the profit of capital at the expense of the livelihood of the workers. The employers invited their shareholders to write to the Bishops to make this clear. Cardinal Richaud, President of the Episcopal Social Commission, kept somewhat aloof from concrete problems, but he recalled the principles which ought effectively to guide Catholics in social and economic questions, and this doctrinal approach was very well received.

In 1954, when it was necessary to break off a certain number of activities in the apostolate, such as those of the priest workers, and to reform others, as in the seminaries of the *Mission de France*, many thought that the Church in France, which had, after the Liberation, gone out to the people with such daring and such love, was now about to draw back into herself. But at that precise moment the Bishops of France, gathered together in plenary assembly, issued a declaration to all Catholics, priests and people, defining the object to be achieved and the line of conduct to be taken. We quote the first lines of this declaration:

The Bishops of France, gathered together in plenary assembly, ask all Catholics to 'be present' in the modern world, in order to understand it, to love it, and to serve it. They must work by secular activity to build it up, and by Catholic and missionary action to save it, having an unflinching trust in the grace of Jesus Christ and in the eternal youth of the Church. They must also be able to judge it with clarity of mind. They must recognize its authentic human values, and, without vain regrets for the past, its capabilities and the hope that it bears for the future. They must at the same time recognize its limitations, its mistakes and its faults, with all the freedom of God's children, so as the better to heal the wounds of humanity, the consequences of sin. . . .

This message in 1954, entitled *L'Eglise au sein du monde moderne et face aux civilisations nouvelles*, still remains the charter of French Catholics; of their hopes and of their work.

EMILE GABEL, A.A.

Translated by Mary Keene.

In characterizing criticism as an academic industry I have the following points in mind. Its being academic means that its audience is also very largely academic. Critics are read by other critics or by would-be critics; and a work of criticism, no matter what its merits as a piece of guidance for the reader whose *métier* is not that of a critic, tends to function as a whetstone upon which other critics sharpen their wits. The largest and most horrendous example of what I have in mind is to be found in the United States: the running battle between the 'New Critics'—Brooks, Tate, Wimsatt and the rest—and the Chicago critics under the generalship of Professor R. S. Crane. A consequence of this is that criticism becomes enmeshed in an elaborate scholasticism, serpentine, repetitive, fruitful in fine technical distinctions and subtle shifts of ground, something of which only the professional can hope to gain a commanding view; and he may be indisposed to strive after such a view, for there are his own theses to elaborate and defend. All this is much more evident in the United States than in this country; but in this as in other fields it is arguable that the looser and less technically advanced models to be found here will soon be displaced. Its being an industry arises out of its being an academic profession in a period when, in the universities, the study of arts and letters is more and more pursued by the method of specialization; and the production of works of scholarship and criticism is geared to the academic machinery by which reputations are made and professional advancement secured. Given the size of the academic community, and the moral values it sucks in from the society that maintains it, it is hard to see how this could be otherwise. But it does mean that criticism is written for the academic community rather than for the cultivated public, with all the large consequences that this entails.

Critics commonly give us only their finished products, not their working notebooks. Professor Tillotson's new work on Pope¹ is something very close to a working notebook, in which he not only sets down a mass of comment upon the text and content of Pope's works and of those of his contemporaries, but also brings in a great deal of related comment upon such nineteenth-century writers as Newman and Thackeray whose work Professor Tillotson has been studying in recent years. It has all the interest of such a notebook, with some of its defects. As he is one of our best scholarly critics, it shows us more of the workings of his mind than a more finished work would do. In its candour—which is almost, at times, ingenuousness—it reveals the presuppositions and working methods of a scholarly critic and brings out the strength and the weakness of both. Altogether, the spectacle is both fascinating and instructive: fascinating in its revelation of the depth and spread of a scholarly and sensitive mind; instructive, in so far as some of the

¹ Geoffrey Tillotson, *Pope and Human Nature*, Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press, 1958, 25s.

little brisker. And so on. All this is to be expected and is healthy. The notion that criticism is or can be an exact science, that eternal rules can be discovered and set out by the critic, is a superstition that—though prophecy is a chancy business—is unlikely to captivate anyone in the future. Such force as the superstition had was drawn from a radical misunderstanding of the cautious empiricism of Aristotle in the *Poetics*. As the temporal perspective shifts, as the pressures and interests of civilization change, as the practice of criticism exercises its pull on the work of original writers and as the work of these writers modifies the sensibilities of critics and provides them with new occasions for reflection, so, inevitably, a battle of the books is provoked. There follow skirmishes, ambushes, pitched battles, victories and defeats, revolutions and counter-revolutions. If one were to suggest, then, that there is a *malaise* of criticism, and were to explain what he meant by pointing to ferocious disputes over method and over the place of this or that writer in the canon, this would indicate an odd use of the word *malaise*. If this be the sickness of criticism, criticism can never be healthy.

All the same, when we survey, in all its brilliance and complexity, the field of criticism written in English, feelings of anxiety may be provoked that are not altogether neurotic. The point of criticism—this is surely a truism—is by analysis, interpretation and comparison to make specific works of literature more luminous and more arresting, and thus more available, to those whose native wit cultivated by education inclines them to the experience of literature. And criticism is an important business, not only because the experience of literature is in itself valuable and needs no extrinsic justification, but also because this experience is one of the sources of spiritual health; it fortifies and illuminates, it is a mark of civilization; and of all the arts literature is the most complete commentary upon the greatness and wretchedness of man.

One source of a certain uneasiness lies in the fact that criticism is so much a vast academic industry eccentric to the main concerns and interests of our civilization. (I am not here concerned with the criticism to be found in the respectable Sunday newspapers and in the weeklies. This is a topic in itself, and an important one, offering rich themes to the sociologist and the moralist. Some of it is of course the work of academics, and some of it is—surprisingly, in view of the conditions under which it has to be done—of a respectable quality; but it is necessarily too hurried and too much played upon by the peculiar influences of political groups, literary cliques and commercial interests to be taken, as criticism, with great seriousness.) To say of criticism that it is academic, and an industry, is not as such to say something disobliging about it; and as to its being eccentric to the main concerns and interests of our civilization, this may be to pass an oblique and damaging comment upon our civilization.

Marjorie Nicolson, Bredvold and others in the United States—in which the main emphasis is laid upon the genealogy and history of ideas, and in which the kind of analysis proper to a philosophical study is eschewed or only lightly touched upon; and such work helps both the philosopher and the critic to avoid anachronistic approaches to particular writers. Philosophers, for example, have too frequently discussed the supposed atheism of Thomas Hobbes without any recognition that he is linked on the one hand with the nominalist theology of the late Middle Ages and on the other with the 'moralist' speculations of the sectarian thinkers of his time. Nineteenth-century Shakespearian criticism was on the whole ignorant of, or set aside as unimportant, the mediaeval background Shakespeare took for granted, and (for example) manufactured sentimental problems about the attitude of the young Henry V to Falstaff, problems that do not arise in this form if we reckon with Shakespeare's idea of kingship.

Tillotson, then, has taken on a formidable job in attempting to give an account of Pope's use of certain concepts. I shall confine myself to what he has to say about Pope's use of 'nature'; and I shall try to show that what he has to say will not do, either as an account of the concept which Pope received or as an account of Pope's use of the concept; and here I shall confine myself to one work, the *Essay on Criticism*.

Tillotson distinguishes two senses of 'nature'. First, there is 'Nature' defined as follows:

I am aware of Pope as a poet who subscribed to the old belief that poets put as much human nature as possible into their poems, that they look to mankind—or Nature, as it was called in Pope's day—for their theme. . . . Nature, when it was not human hands and feet, was, and of course is still, that quantum of the mind-and-heart which all men—past, present, and in theory future—hold in common.¹

This is not very much like a definition, but Tillotson himself says he has in the passage I have quoted 'defined' the sense in which he is going to use 'Nature'. Another sense of 'nature' is intended when the capital letter is omitted: this is 'nature' as meaning 'merely the material universe'.² Later, Tillotson glances at the history of the term,³ referring to Aristotle, Cicero, St Vincent of Lerins (at a further stage of the book he even glides into treating the *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus* of St Vincent as 'St Vincent's definition of Nature'⁴), Quintilian, Longinus, Shakespeare, Dryden, Milton, Davenant, Hobbes, Wordsworth, Johnson, Tennyson, Thackeray, Arnold, George Eliot, Charles Reade

¹ *Pope and Human Nature*, p. 1.

² *Ibid.*, p. v.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 19 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

virtues and vices of the academic critic are there exemplified. A consideration of it is thus highly relevant to the general points I have advanced concerning the state of criticism. If an excuse has to be offered for treating Tillotson's work as a case-book as well as a note-book, it is that as one of the richest products of scholarly criticism today it illuminates and illustrates the predicaments of the academic study of literature.

Twenty years ago Tillotson published *On the Poetry of Pope*. This was in itself a masterly work, and was of historic importance both as a sign and a cause of that revaluation of the work of Pope which is now pretty well taken for granted and which has its splendid monument in the Twickenham Edition, a venture with which Tillotson has himself been closely connected. In the present work he is concerned, he explains, not so much with Pope's 'methods of expression' as with 'the material Pope expresses'.¹ That is, he is concerned with certain key concepts—'nature', 'truth', 'the beautiful', 'man' and so on—employed or presupposed by Pope and with the moral and social implications of Pope's use of these concepts.² This is an enquiry of great interest and importance, and of great difficulty. Pope is so much a central figure in the culture of his day that an enquiry into his use of such concepts should tell us quite as much about his period as it does about Pope's mind and should thus enable us to handle more easily a variety of philosophical and religious problems of interest to the student of the English eighteenth century; and in so far as the thought of this period helps to form the thought of the nineteenth century—and that it does so is increasingly recognized—the usefulness of the enquiry has no obviously determinable limits. The difficulty about this enquiry is that it seems to require analytical abilities that are quite other than the analytical abilities of the literary critic and a wide acquaintance with the history of the concepts which are being discussed. Concepts such as those Tillotson is interested in do not have the bound uses of the concepts of mathematics or natural science; their uses are immensely complex and their lines of ancestry run far back; and a part of the understanding of their complexity is the understanding of their ancestry. The ability to use a set of concepts or to understand the use of a set of concepts is not the same thing as the ability to state what these uses are. Speaking a language is itself a highly complex performance; but though it is characteristic of one who speaks a language that he is continually heeding a vast number of rules, it is not a characteristic of the expert user of a language that he is able to state any of the rules he continually heeds. Of course, very useful work can be done—as by Lovejoy,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. v.

² Tillotson does in fact concern himself a good deal, especially in the later chapters, with Pope's 'methods of expression', and what he has to say on this topic is always happy and instructive.

Unerring NATURE, still divinely bright,
 One clear, unchang'd, and universal light,
 Life, force, and beauty, must to all impart,
 At once the source, and end, and test of Art.
 Art from that fund each just supply provides;
 Works without show, and without pomp presides:
 In some fair body thus th' informing soul
 With spirits feeds, with vigor fills the whole,
 Each motion guides, and ev'ry nerve sustains;
 Itself unseen, but in th' effects remains.

(ll. 68-79)

Plainly these lines contain no useful advice: they express, with great vigour and precision, an *attitude*; and it would be a mistake to ask in too peremptory a voice: What does it mean? i.e. What propositions expressible in other words can be squeezed out of the passage? It is precisely as the expression of an attitude to poetry and the criticism of poetry that the *Essay* is impressive, both as illustrating, in action as it were, Pope's sensibility and intelligence, and as illuminating the valuations of the literary society of which Pope was so self-conscious a member.¹

The attitude Pope seeks to inculcate at the beginning of the poem will be—whatever the superficial *logical* relation of the passage to the rest of the poem—*rhetorically* decisive.

'Tis hard to say, if greater want of skill
 Appear in writing or in judging ill;
 But, of the two, less dang'rous is th' offence
 To tire our patience, than mislead our sense.
 Some few in that, but numbers err in this,
 Ten censure wrong for one who writes amiss;
 A fool might once himself alone expose,
 Now one in verse makes many more in prose.

'Tis with our judgments as our watches, none
 Go just alike, yet each believes his own.
 In Poets as true Genius is but rare,
 True Taste as seldom is the Critic's share;
 Both must alike from Heav'n derive their light,
 These born to judge, as well as those to write.
 Let such teach others who themselves excel,
 And censure freely who have written well.
 Authors are partial to their wit, 'tis true,
 But are not Critics to their judgment too?

¹ Tillotson makes an excellent point when he observes: '[Pope's] unfolding of a poet's personality is a new thing in English poetry, being completer than that of Donne, who from this point of view is his strongest predecessor.' *Pope and Human Nature*, p. 142.

and Voltaire. All these writers could certainly with propriety be cited in a history of the concept of nature. What is somewhat puzzling and even alarming is that Tillotson seems to imply that in all these cases 'nature' has a roughly similar connotation; equally puzzling and equally alarming, if we were really concerned with the history of the concept, is the omission of any reference to the three writers (in English) whose discussions of the concept are really decisive: Hooker, Locke and Hume. But in fact we are not at all concerned with the history of the concept. If we really were concerned with the history of the concept we should have to bring out that Aristotle's *physis*, for example, is not at all the same concept as Hobbes's 'nature' and entails a different and contradictory set of logical consequences. All that Tillotson wishes to say is that the literature which common consent places in the canon is concerned with the exploration and statement of what is common to men considered as desiring and passionate, feeling, and rational animals—he quotes, and this is the heart of his contention, Arnold's tag about 'the great primary human affections' which are the subject-matter of great literature. That this is often what writers have meant when they have made use of 'nature' as a critical criterion is true; but it is profoundly unilluminating as a comment upon the history of the concept from Aristotle to the nineteenth century; and, as I shall show, it is inadequate as a help to the analysis of Pope's use of the concept.

I shall now examine the *Essay on Criticism*, with the *Essay on Man*¹ perhaps the most 'philosophical' of Pope's works, in order to establish two points: that Pope is not relying upon the concept of nature as defined by Tillotson; and that Pope *uses* the ambiguities of the concept—ambiguities which arise out of its complex history—in order to frame, not a critical *argument*² in any way to be compared with the critical work of Aristotle or Johnson or Coleridge, but a poem capable of evoking an attitude to criticism and to the subject-matter of criticism.

In so far as we attempt to analyse the *Essay* into its component critical doctrines and arguments, it turns out to be a mosaic of scraps from Aristotle, Horace, Boileau and other critics. An early passage appears to contain advice on the practice of criticism.

First follow Nature, and your judgment frame
By her just standard, which is still the same:

¹ I have discussed the *Essay on Man* in 'Doctrinal to an Age: Notes towards a Re-valuation of Pope's *Essay on Man*', DUBLIN REVIEW, Second Quarter 1951, No. 452.

² Professor Sutherland seems to me profoundly wrong (about Pope, not perhaps about Dryden) where he writes: 'The poetry of Dryden, Pope, Thomson, Johnson, Gray, Goldsmith is not *merely* a poetry of good sense, but good sense it is. The poetical structure is not held together by emotional stresses but by a sort of *steel framework of intellectual argument*.' (My italics.) James Sutherland, *A Preface to Eighteenth Century Poetry*, 1948, p. 161. I may add that this is one of the few places where I would venture to disagree with Professor Sutherland.

a *techné* analogous to the art of making clockwork mechanisms.¹ Both the critic and the poet are the creatures of Heaven; and this carries with it the implication that Pope is exploring, and describing in an authoritative way, a providential order; but the whole tone is that of one who surveys the scene rather than that of one who participates in it.

Nature provides for all. But what a botch most make of this provision! No doubt 'Most have the seeds of judgement in their mind'; but the impression Pope conveys is of a swarming multitude of malignant fools.

By l. 45 Pope has thus created the impression—though this is not what he explicitly *says*—that the true critic, even one who is potentially such, is a rare creature who, no matter how rich his natural endowments, may more easily go wrong than not. There is thus a deliberately created tension between Nature's provision, the providential order expounded with authority by Pope, and the presence everywhere of human perversity. This dramatic tension is commended to us by the double attitude expressed: on the one hand, the poet is, like the rest of us, painstakingly peering through the gloom of a teasingly difficult subject, on the other, he has an Olympian, god-like power of surveying the scene with a penetrating gaze and estimating the capacities and performances of the actors. This is calculated both to reassure us—after all, he is one of us, he has his difficulties too—and impress us—he speaks with authority. And we are disposed (so far as we submit to the mood evoked by the poem) to accept the authority precisely because it seems initially not to be claimed.

The vehicle of the argument is a diagram rather than a picture. The poet of genius is represented as surrounded by a swarm of abortions and monstrosities, the bad critics, those who have choked in themselves 'the seeds of judgement'. And in spite of its being plainly suggested that the endowments of the poet and the critic are different, the large assumption is made, and enforced upon us by the very fact that this is a poem, that the poet is here competent to establish the rationale, the limitations and the methods of criticism.

An attitude having been established, a mood induced, Pope now advances to an elaborate disquisition on 'nature', and this occupies the remainder of the first part of the *Essay*.

'Nature' and 'the natural' are among the trickiest of concepts and if Pope were concerned with anything at all resembling a philosophical analysis and account, his first task would be to analyse what is in fact a large and unruly family of concepts into its individual members, lest

¹ This idea is worked out in Hobbes's Introduction to *Leviathan*. 'Nature' is here 'Art' in the sense of a *techné*, to be understood in the light of the mechanical arts. Nothing could be farther from the Aristotelian *physis*, with its emphasis on the analogy of organism.

Yet if we look more closely, we shall find
 Most have the seeds of judgment in their mind:
 Nature affords at least a glimm'ring light;
 The lines, tho' touch'd but faintly, are drawn right.
 But as the slightest sketch, if justly trac'd,
 Is by ill-colouring but the more disgrac'd,
 So by false learning is good sense defac'd:
 Some are bewilder'd in the maze of schools,
 And some made coxcombs Nature meant but fools.
 In search of wit these lose their common sense,
 And then turn Critics in their own defence:
 Each burns alike, who can, or cannot write,
 Or with a Rival's, or an Eunuch's spite.
 All fools have still an itching to deride,
 And fain would be upon the laughing side.
 If Maevius scribble in Apollo's spight,
 There are, who judge still worse than he can write.
 (ll. 1-35)

We are given first a picture of the poet, identifying himself with all reasonable men ('our patience . . . our sense'), surrounded by a horde of, in the main, foolish critics. They are perhaps more than foolish. They may be *dangerous* (l. 3), even if they are also, and this is stressed in the lines immediately following, obscenely ludicrous.

Some have at first for Wits, then Poets past,
 Turn'd critics next, and prov'd plain fools at last.
 Some neither can for Wits nor Critics pass,
 As heavy mules are neither horse nor ass.
 Those half-learn'd witlings, numerous in our isle,
 As half-form'd insects on the banks of Nile;
 Unfinish'd things, one knows not what to call,
 Their generation's so equivocal:
 To tell 'em would an hundred tongues require,
 Or one vain wit's, that might a hundred tire.
 (ll. 36-45)

The 'Tis hard to say' of the beginning is designed to give an impression of fair-mindedness; but with the arrival of the images of the mule and the abortive insects we know that the poet is taking sides, though the initial assumption of fairness and Olympian detachment somehow persuades us that he has a right to bestow praise and blame.

Next: original endowment is not a matter of skill, at least, not of our skill. The comparison between 'judgments' and 'watches' (this figure has an ancestry and a posterity) suggests that 'Heaven's' skill is in question, that is, the rules by which human nature has been framed are

wit and judgement get out of balance—wit being roughly the original energy of the intellect, judgement the capacity to direct the original energy into particular channels) are 'Nature . . . Nature methodiz'd'.

If we want to ask what kind of a noun, here, 'Nature' is, what it is used to represent, it is plain that there is more than one answer to the question. But this would surely be an inappropriate question. All the answers are necessary to Pope. In order to achieve the kind of effect he aims at Nature must simultaneously be God, the world, the soul of the world, the rules for the production of art, the standards of the critic, a reservoir of cosmic energy, the inspiration of the poet; even, as he begins to make clear at the end of the passage cited, and then goes on to elaborate, a particular body of literature, sometimes the work of one author, namely, Homer.

When first young Maro in his boundless mind
A work t' outlast immortal Rome design'd
Perhaps he seem'd above the Critic's law,
And but from Nature's fountain scorn'd to draw:
But when t' examine ev'ry part he came,
Nature and Homer were, he found, the same.

(ll. 130-5)

An interesting specific use by Pope of one of the ambiguities is provided by the reference to the rules of ancient literature, especially Homer, as providing 'natural' guidance for the poet. This must cause difficulties and it is to be expected that Pope will provide himself with an escape-clause. Of course, he does so.

Some beauties yet no Precepts can declare,
For there's a happiness as well as care.
Music resembles Poetry, in each
Are nameless graces which no methods teach,
And which a master-hand alone can reach.
If, where the rules not far enough extend,
(Since rules were made but to promote their end)
Some lucky licence answer to the full
Th' intent propos'd, that Licence is a rule.
Thus Pegasus, a nearer way to take,
May boldly deviate from the common track.
Great wits sometimes may gloriously offend,
And rise to faults true Critics dare not mend;
From vulgar bounds with brave disorder part,
And snatch a grace beyond the reach of art . . .

(ll. 141-55)

Now, the interest of this particular escape-clause is that it doesn't, as one might expect, rend the texture of the poem: for spontaneity, beauty

the discussion should founder upon the ambiguities of the concepts. 'Natural', for example, can mean 'primitive', 'normal', 'right', 'good', 'uncivilized', 'civilized', 'factual', 'existing', and so on. It is pointless to ask what the *real* meaning of the term is: all these meanings are perfectly good since they all represent established uses. Now, Pope's procedure is the direct opposite of the philosophical. He *uses* the ambiguity of the concept, its being capable of suggesting a vast unruly family, to achieve a certain result.

Lines 68-79 have already been quoted on pp. 158-9 above. The poem continues:

Some, to whom Heav'n in wit has been profuse,
Want as much more to turn it to its use;
For wit and judgment often are at strife,
Tho' meant each other's aid, like man and wife.
'Tis more to guide, than spur the Muse's steed;
Restrain his fury, than provoke his speed;
The winged courser, like a gen'rous horse,
Shews most true mettle when you check his course.

Those RULES of old discover'd, not devis'd,
Are Nature still, but Nature methodiz'd;
Nature, like Liberty, is but restrain'd
By the same Laws which first herself ordain'd.

Hear how learn'd Greece her useful rules indites,
When to repress, and when indulge our flights:
High on Parnassus' top her sons she show'd,
And pointed out those arduous paths they trod;
Held from afar, aloft, th' immortal prize,
And urg'd the rest by equal steps to rise.
Just precepts thus from great examples giv'n,
She drew from them what they deriv'd from Heav'n.
(ll. 80-99)

These senses of 'nature' may be distinguished. (1) A quasi-deity, infallible, unchanging, illuminating in virtue of its deity ('divinely bright'). (2) A source of power ('Life, force, and beauty'). (3) A repository of criteria for judgement ('your judgement frame/By her just standard'). (4) The *source* of art, perhaps as providing rules for a *techné*, certainly source as a fountain of energy, as the shaper—demiurge—of the world and men: through vagueness we can hold all these ideas as it were in solution. (5) The *end* of art; perhaps no more is suggested than that art has a purpose and that this purpose enjoys cosmic approval. (6) Nature *is* Art and Art *is* Nature; the two concepts are run together in lines 74-9. This is confirmed if we pass on to lines 88-91. Here it is said that the rules of art (to be summarily stated as: Don't let

Of all the causes which conspire to blind
 Man's erring judgement, and misguide the mind,
 What the weak head with strongest bias rules,
 Is *Pride*, the never-failing vice of fools.
 Whatever Nature has in worth deny'd,
 She gives in large recruits of needful *Pride* . . .

(ll. 201-206)

This is to make Nature a fountain of stupidity.

I shall not offer a detailed analysis of the rest of the poem. My main purposes: to bring out the complexities and ambiguities of the concept of nature; to suggest that these complexities and ambiguities are rooted in the history of the concept; to show that the structure of the poem is not a 'steel framework of intellectual argument' but a wonderfully skilful exploitation of the conceptual ambiguities: have been accomplished by the analysis so far given.

We are now in a position to see the inadequacy of Tillotson's definitions and general account of 'nature'. He selects one use—that which is common to all men at all times—as central and primary, another—'the material universe', *natura naturata*—as the main secondary use; whereas it is clear from an examination of the *Essay on Criticism* alone that Pope's family of concepts is much richer and more various and that from the standpoint of poetic analysis, to say nothing of the history of ideas, Tillotson's account will not do.

Tillotson makes a number of positive mistakes as a consequence of his failure fully to explore the concepts Pope is using. For example, he quotes the famous passage from the sixth of Newman's *Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education*.

Quarry the granite rock with razors, or moor the vessel with a thread of silk; then may you hope with such keen and delicate instruments as human knowledge and human reason to contend against those giants, the passion and the pride of man.

He comments: 'Indeed, if pressed, Pope might have agreed with Newman.'¹ The fact is that in this matter Pope and Newman belong to two absolutely distinct traditions of thought. For Pope, 'reason' exercises a powerful influence upon conduct.

Two Principles in human nature reign;
 Self-love, to urge, and Reason, to restrain;

Self-love, the spring of motion, acts the soul;
 Reason's comparing balance rules the whole.²

¹ *Pope and Human Nature*, p. 47.

² *An Essay on Man*, Epistle II, ll. 53, 54 and 59, 60.

uncovenanted for and uncontrived, that which is, as Pope perceives and states, analogous to Grace in the language of theology, are held within the general scope of the idea of Nature by the particular idea of Nature as a fountain of psychic energy; from such a fountain we should expect to draw spontaneity rather than rules. But the conflation of Nature as infinitely various and as predictably regular enables Pope to overcome what might otherwise be a destructive paradox.

In the last paragraph of the First Part—

Still green with bays each ancient Altar stands
Above the reach of sacrilegious hands

—Pope stresses the charm and prestige of classical culture under the image of the supernatural, though it is the supernatural domesticated by centuries of humanistic education in a Christian society. But with this ending, the disorderly junk-shop of concepts he has assembled—it is in fact a *résumé* of all those traditions in which the words *physis* and *natura* have had a role—is given an appearance of order and a sacred character. And Pope takes the opportunity to give himself a central place in the tradition, and to re-emphasize the combination of humility with authority he has imposed upon us at the beginning of the poem, in the closing lines of the First Part:

Hail, Bards triumphant! born in happier days;
Immortal heirs of universal praise!
Whose honours with increase of ages grow,
As streams roll down, enlarging as they flow;
Nations unborn your mighty names shall sound,
And worlds applaud that must not yet be found!
O may some spark of your celestial fire,
The last, the meanest of your sons inspire,
(That on weak wings, from far, pursues your flights;
Glow while he reads, but trembles as he writes)
To teach vain Wits a science little known,
T' admire superior sense, and doubt their own!
(ll. 189-200)

Pope is 'the last, the meanest of your sons'; but he is a *son*, not an inter-loper in the family; and he prays to be a teacher, for it is he who is to instruct the 'vain Wits'.

With the Second Part of the *Essay* there is a change of tone and of atmosphere, and a conceptual change as well. One way of putting the change would be to say that there is a shift of level from the *cosmic* to the *moral*, from *natura naturans* and *natura naturata* to Nature as a compendium of the rules of prudence and morality. The shift is not complete; and it is interesting to note that in so far as Nature is still conceived as a creative force she has now a somewhat malign touch.

The moral life is for Pope, as it was for Milton, a battle between 'passion' and 'reason'. Newman, on the contrary, is in the passage cited echoing (whether he is fully conscious of this or not) the doctrine of Hume, who did so much to shape his early philosophical development, the doctrine, namely, 'that reason alone can never be a motive to any action of the will; and . . . that it can never oppose passion in the direction of the will'.¹ It is true, Newman gives the doctrine a new appearance by setting it in a context which is not that of Hume; but the ancestry of Newman's handling of the topic is clear and the logical nuance upon which Newman's point rests was quite unknown to Pope.

Again, he quotes Lovejoy's observation that 'the Roman jurists had . . . identified *jus naturale* with *jus gentium*' (in itself a perfectly correct observation), without pointing out—what is crucial for the whole history of Natural Law—that the later Stoics, and later the Fathers and the scholastic theologians, and later still the natural law schools of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, had expressly distinguished between the *jus naturale* and the *jus gentium*; arguing that certain institutions and practices that were certainly a part of the *jus gentium* (notably slavery, private property, and the use of coercive power by the State) were contrary to the *jus naturale*. The *jus naturale* is thus conceived as a criterion for distinguishing the good from the bad parts of the *jus gentium*; and the dominant tradition in natural law is delivered, whatever logical difficulties it may encounter, from the vulgarity of 'whatever is, is right'. In fact, the tension between the Natural conceived as the Ideal and the Natural conceived as the Actual is important even in Pope.²

Where Tillotson treats of Pope's 'methods of expression' rather than 'the material Pope expresses' he is, as in *On the Poetry of Pope*, superb. An especially fine chapter is that on 'Man, Poetry, and Pope's Poetry', which contains a penetrating discussion of Pope's language and word-order, use of metre and use of literary forms. He so worships Pope that he is at times inclined to claim too much for him. He exaggerates unnecessarily, for Pope is great enough not to need this kind of extravagance, when he writes as follows of his satirical verse:

If he elected to be a satirist, he saw to it that none of his poetic gifts went unemployed; he directed them all into his satire. This is what makes it unique: it is as if a score of poets had written it contributing their individual gifts to it as friends and strangers contributed coloured stones to his grotto: it is as if Virgil and Milton,

¹ David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book II, Part III, Section III.

² Cf. the discussion of the State of Nature in *An Essay on Man*, Epistle III. Here there is little confusion of the brute universality of fact with the universality of the moral order.

Marvell, Keats and Tennyson had collaborated with Horace, and Dryden, and Swift.¹

It is this extravagance in his estimate of Pope's achievement that accounts for his evasion of a problem that must be looked at by anyone who attempts a critical estimate of the poetry. When Matthew Arnold said that Dryden and Pope were 'classics of an age of prose' he was wrong, and badly wrong, as a first reading of, say, the second of the *Moral Essays* ('Of the Characters of Women') or of *Eloisa to Abelard* or of the close of *The Dunciad* is enough to show. But wrong as Arnold is, he has a genuine point in mind, though it is not the one he makes. In the last analysis we have to say that Shakespeare and Donne and Marvell, and Wordsworth and Coleridge, are not simply excellent poets in a different mode from that of Pope: they are in a sense more genuinely poetic in a demonstrable sense. When in his essay in *The Rambler* Johnson criticizes Macbeth's speech—

Come, thick night!
And pall thee in the dunest smoke of hell,
That my keen knife see not the wound it makes;
Nor heav'n peep through the blanket of the dark,
To cry, Hold, hold!

—on the ground that 'dun', 'knife' and 'peep through the blanket' are low expressions, he tells us a great deal about the age of Pope and about the limitations of even the greatest poetry of the age, that of Pope himself. The limitations of this poetry are the limitations of an entire culture, limitations which show themselves in politics, philosophy and religion, as well as in poetry: the vital connexion between the language of poetry and common speech which is a ground of the vigour and power to move of Shakespeare's verse is almost broken. We may illustrate these limitations by returning to the *Essay on Criticism* which is in the modern jargon something of a cultural manifesto. In the course of a discussion of style and diction Pope writes:

Expression is the dress of thought, and still
Appears more decent, as more suitable;
A vile conceit in pompous words express'd
Is like a clown in regal purple dress'd:
For diff'rent styles with diff'rent subjects sort,
As sev'ral garbs with country, town, and court.
(ll. 318-23)

There are two points to notice here. Pope expresses the characteristic theory, influential from at least the time of Hobbes down to our own

¹ *Pope and Human Nature*, p. 237.

day, that 'thought' is related to 'words' as the body to clothes or as (on the Platonic or the Cartesian model) the soul to the body. This is more than a theoretical blunder: it adversely affects poetic practice, since the supposition of the poet is that the distinctive devices of poetry are embellishments of thoughts that could be expressed, with less elegance, it is true, but with no serious diminution of intellectual content, in prose. On all this the most penetrating comment is that contained in Wordsworth's aphorism: 'Words are not thought's dress but its incarnation.' That is, words are to thought as the body is to the soul, on the Aristotelian and not the Cartesian model. The other point to note is the parallel, drawn by Pope, between 'styles' and the clothes appropriate to 'country, town, and court'. These are not three divisions of the nation, but three divisions of polite society. The nation, which talks the language of knives and blankets, bitches, black-puddings and cow-heels,¹ is excluded from the poetic cosmos. English society under the Whig oligarchy was split in a way that the cruder society of Shakespeare's day was not; and the split was not only within society; it was within the cultivated man, too; and the price paid is, as Wordsworth, perhaps more than any other critic, perceived, a loss of depth and imaginative power. We may again illustrate this from the *Essay on Criticism*. Of the unity which the best 'work of Wit' will have, Pope writes:

In Wit, as Nature, what affects our hearts
Is not th' exactness of peculiar parts;
'Tis not a lip, or eye, we beauty call,
But the joint force and full result of all.
Thus when we view some well-proportion'd dome,
(The world's just wonder, and ev'n thine, O Rome!)
No single parts unequally surprise,
All comes united to th' admiring eyes;
No monstrous height, or breadth, or length appear;
The Whole at once is bold and regular.

(ll. 243-52)

This contempt for York and Canterbury and Chartres and Cologne exactly parallels the contemporary attitude to Chaucer and Shakespeare. Neo-classicism is not seen for what it is, despite its splendid achievements in all the arts: a narrowing and impoverishment of the human spirit.

Earlier I remarked that Tillotson has presented us with what is in effect one of his notebooks, and it may be that some of the criticisms I have pressed are inappropriate to this genre of critical writing. It is nevertheless true that in its unguarded character, in the absence of the

¹ Cf. the discussion of the difficulties of Fenton (Pope's collaborator in the translation of Homer) over a passage in the *Odyssey*, in Sutherland, *op. cit.*, pp. 88, 89.

caveats that one might have expected to find in a more finished work, some of the difficulties of the academic criticism of literature are betrayed.

It seems evident that in the academic study of literature—as in the academic study of philosophy—the history of ideas is seriously neglected; and that this is a consequence of excessive specialization. I have cited a number of instances in Tillotson's book, where this enormously learned and sensitive scholar fails to handle the *literary* problem well through a failure to grasp the history of the concept of nature. Other illustrations could have been given from works by other men. A trivial instance is provided by Mr Raymond Williams in his remarkable study, *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. In a discussion of Burke, Williams writes:

Burke's attack [i.e. upon the Revolution in France] was upon democracy, *as we now commonly understand it*.¹ (My italics.)

If the 'we' means, as it surely must, the English and the Americans, the French and the Swiss, this can be seen to be wrong simply by noting that neither the theory nor the practice of democracy as 'we' understand it could have been known to Burke or to anyone living at that time. But the important point is a deeper one: that Burke had in mind, just as the Jacobins had in mind, democracy in the classical sense, the democracy of the Greek cities, the democracy for which (or so it was believed) the Roman plebs had struggled. This is democracy understood as direct rule by the poor and its theoretical expression in our own period is the dictatorship of the proletariat. The domination of Burke's mind, and of the European mind in general, by classical discussions and models may be a misfortune; but it is an unmistakable feature of the history of ideas. Later than Burke, in the case of Macaulay (for example, in his speeches on the Reform Bill), even in the case of Bagehot, the extension of the franchise beyond the middle class, that is, an approach towards democracy in 'our' sense, was feared because it was thought to carry with it a danger of democracy in the classical sense, and with it the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. Later, Williams notes that Burke 'argued that the tendency of democracy was to tyranny';² and it is apposite to remark that this is, as well as a sound prediction of the course of the French Revolution, a commonplace of Greek political theory, and that this theory is pretty certainly one of the sources of Burke's confidence.

The moral of this might seem to be that we lack in this country anything like the strenuous pursuit of the history of ideas as this is understood in the United States and finely represented by Lovejoy and

¹ Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society 1780-1950*, 1958, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

others. A centre for the study of the history of ideas would certainly be a good thing and it is immaterial, or so I think, whether this is nurtured in departments of philosophy or history or English literature. But something more modest could accomplish a good deal. Academic persons are always discussing the dangers of specialization, and these dangers are real. The retreat from specialization could, if it ever took place, be just as dangerous; it could lead to no more than *haute vulgarisation* and slipshod syntheses. My argument has been that in the interests of e.g. literary studies quite strictly conceived, the help of other specialists, as fellow teachers and co-operating scholars, is desirable. If we are to discuss the concept of nature in Pope, the relevance of Hartleian psychology to Wordsworth, the use of Scotist concepts by Hopkins, it is essential that this should be done in the light of what the professional scholar has to say, not simply for the sake of accuracy, but for the sake, too, of the interpretative and critical task. It may be that the establishment in university departments of English literature of teaching posts in the history of ideas would be a useful first step.¹

An apology is perhaps due to Tillotson for making his rich book an occasion for a somewhat carping sermon. Collingwood once said that the only writers he bothered to criticize were those whose names he wished to mention *honoris causa*. This must emphatically be true of any mention of Tillotson. His work, so widely ranging and so informed in the field of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century studies, is a continual rebuke to narrowness and pedantry.

¹ Of course, much has already been done in a variety of ways. There are Professor Willey's useful *Background* books, very much in the spirit of Leslie Stephen's pioneer and still indispensable works on the thinkers of the eighteenth century and on the English Utilitarians. Such works as D. G. James's *Scepticism and Poetry* and *The Romantic Comedy* represent important work in the exploration of interconnected literary and philosophical themes. Much recent work on Shakespeare—I have in mind, for instance, Miss Parker's *The Slave of Life*—exemplifies the approach I am commending. In Miss Elizabeth Sewall's *The Field of Nonsense* we are presented with a mind of rare power in both literary and philosophical analysis. This list could be greatly prolonged. Again, we may expect a great deal of those universities where there are joint schools of philosophy and English literature and philosophy and history, in so far as these schools represent co-operation in scholarly work as well as in teaching.

POLAND'S CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE

By AXEL HEYST

TRANSLATIONS of books by contemporary Polish writers have recently appeared in the West and have produced lively comment. Jan Dobraczynski's *Letters from Nicodemus* have been published in English¹ (Dobraczynski is one of the Catholic writers of Poland, and his book may revive in some English readers echoes of Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*); K. Brandys's *Mother of the Krols Family*² has been published in French; Leopold Tyrmand's *Żły* ('The Bad One') has appeared in English, and Marek Hłasko's short stories have been printed in several journals in Paris as well as in English and Italian periodicals.

Hłasko's collections of short stories, especially his long short stories, *Cemeteries* and *Next One to Paradise*, are due to be offered to English readers some time in 1959 (they have already been published in Western Germany and the United States).³ Articles sketching his profile have appeared in *Le Figaro* and in the *Manchester Guardian*, and interviews with that angry young man of Poland in the *Paris L'Express* and other papers. This, coupled with attacks levelled at him by Polish papers accusing him of being a 'slanderer of the People's Republic' and a 'smuggler of anti-Communist weapons', as well as the withdrawal from the 1958 Cannes Film Festival of a picture based on one of his short stories, have prepared a propitious climate in which a *succès de scandale* for the young Pole is almost assured. His decision not to return to Poland was commented upon by many papers in this country and on the Continent; though the manner of his choosing freedom did not meet with approval of public opinion in Poland.

This is not the first 'break through' to the West of the literature of contemporary Poland; but still the West—in the Polish view—takes too little interest in the tragic happenings in Poland. Czesław Miłosz's *The Captive Mind* should be mentioned as one of the most illuminating

¹ London: Heinemann.

² It seems best to render all titles in English.

³ His long short story, *The Eighth Day of the Week*, was recently published by Allen & Unwin.

volumes about 'the God that failed'. Miłosz, a fugitive from Communist rule, working in Paris since 1951, brought a lucid and closely reasoned message about the corroding influence on the human mind of Communism and its lies. And though Khrushchev's speech denouncing Stalin, and his admissions of torture and brutality applied to obtain confessions, have partly undermined Miłosz's arguments (for he rather concentrated on the importance of the psychological methods used to enslave and corrupt the human mind, neglecting the power of sheer physical pressure), his central thesis remains unimpaired. There is little doubt that *The Captive Mind*, being an authentic voice from behind the iron curtain, appealed to the intellectuals of the West because it was written by an intellectual and couched in terms and 'diction' likely to be acceptable to intellectuals. Besides Miłosz, who became a refugee rather late in the day, Polish writers of an older vintage have been working in the West: men like J. Lechon—once a magnificent poet, threatened with sterility in his years of exile—who died tragically in New York; K. Wierzyński, the ever-green poet with an enormous gift of regeneration; Madame Z. Kossak (she returned to Poland nearly four years ago), whose novels on St Francis (*Blessed are the Meek*), the Crusades and certain biblical themes were translated into English (her book on St Francis became a best seller in the United States during the late war); Madame M. Kuncewicz, whose delicately sketched stories were published in this country in English translation; the late Madame H. Nagler, whose *roman-fleuve* about the Krauze family was also rendered into English; W. Gombrowicz, that quixotic and tremendously self-centred writer whose experimental pre-war novel *Ferdynand* appeared last year in a French translation; A. Bobkowski, author of a thoughtful diary about France under German occupation; T. Nowakowski, a young writer of great promise, and many others.

But the infiltration into, or penetration of, the West by works of Polish authors has been regarded by Poles themselves as inadequate; especially with books about the German occupation and its terrors (only W. Zagórski's *The Wind of Freedom*, describing the 1944 Warsaw Rising, and K. Żylińska's story about the Auschwitz annihilation camp, have appeared in English). And the recent translations of some distinguished contemporary Polish literature raises the question: why do so few translations from that rich, interesting source find their way to the West? On the other hand, Poland has contributed several eminent writers using the medium of a foreign language. Suffice to mention here Joseph Conrad in England, G. Apollinaire—and to a minor extent Oscar Miłosz, Théodore de Wyzewa and Fortunat Strowski—in France, and Stanislas Przybyszewski in Germany, whose writings, especially his *Totenmesse*, were greatly praised in the late 'nineties.

When examining the phenomenon of the limited impression made

abroad by Polish literature, which at the time of the renaissance was already a fully fledged literature, in a position to boast of a tradition dating from the fifteenth century, and when contrasting this with successes gained abroad by, for instance, modern Scandinavian writers, we come to the conclusion that several factors militate against the popularity and power of penetration of Polish writings. Poland's loss of independence in the closing years of the eighteenth century excluded her for more than a hundred and twenty years from the normal blood-circulation of Europe, relegating her to the backwaters.

The tragedy of Poland's subjection and partitioning also gave rise to another phenomenon. The country shut in by the political domination of foreign Powers relapsed into an intensely nationalistic frame of mind. Its energies became concentrated on problems of survival; its literature assumed the exalted position of a politico-ideological forum.

This intense and often morbid preoccupation with the problems of national survival and of liberation from the foreign yoke severely restricted the scope of Polish literature and made it difficult for it to communicate its significance to the outside world. Even such great Polish poets as Mickiewicz were known in the West (mostly in France and Germany) as revolutionary prophets and ideologues rather than as poets.

To these causes others can be added: the narrow scope of the Polish language compared with languages of much greater diffusion (Russian) and the political power motives which always play an important part in cultural relations. The superiority of French and English literature was based not only on the world character of their languages but also on the fact that both those countries were Great Powers, enjoying an enormous prestige and authority. No such political power has backed the literature of Eastern Europe—with the exception of Russia. Poland was reduced, by her geographical position, to an infinitely less interesting and exciting role than either Germany or Russia. Through decades she had been interpreted to the West mostly through German science and scholarship, from history to geography, and overshadowed by the Russian colossus which could produce much more startling and 'exotic' literature. This element of 'extremeness' in that literature (and no literature could beat a novelist like Dostoyevsky at the game; in the audacity of psychological analysis, in the penetration of the dark recesses of human mind the Russian novel remains unsurpassed) worked also against a wider spread of Polish writings in the West. Poles are often unable to grasp the fact that their literature is a sort of half-way house between East and West; and that the West prefers the unmixed attractions of the East.

These seem to be the reasons for the modest popularity of Polish literature in the Anglo-Saxon world. The dearth of good translations into English is also responsible for that sorry state of affairs.

Now, however, it seems that a genuine interest in the literature of

What of the literature of Poland? How does it fare in these turbulent times of stresses and strains, of pressures once eased and now re-applied? It is amazing how that literature, in spite of the all-out offensive since 1945 of a system alien to the country by its completely different set of values, has succeeded in preserving a spiritual integrity. Writers of the older generation, such as Maria Dabrowska and Jan Parandowski, have held the fort with exemplary bravery: Dabrowska by resorting at the height of the 'Stalinist night' to translating Pepys's *Diaries* rather than write to official rule (silence was at that time more eloquent than writing; many writers sought refuge in translating Shakespeare, Byron, French and German classics, refusing to commit themselves to the party line); and then greeting the 'thaw' with her story, *Wedding in the Country*. Parandowski never deviated from his course, always loyal to his ardent love of the classical world and of Western and Christian values (*Mediterranean Hour*, *Petrarca*, *The Sundial*).

To the same older generation two outstanding poets and prose writers belong: J. Iwaszkiewicz and Antoni Słonimski. Iwaszkiewicz can look back on an illustrious career which began with luscious poetry and turned more and more towards prose. Some of his short stories will be classed among the finest produced in the twentieth-century literature of Poland. He appears to be much less lucky with historical novels; his recent short story, *The Uptake*, a brutally frank exposure of the sordid past, should be translated into English. This story, conceived as a reply to Camus, seems to me to be one of the most shattering things that have come from war-ridden Europe in the last few years. Antoni Słonimski, who returned to Poland from the West at the height of the 'Stalinist night', regained his moral courage for which he was famous before the war and proved a real force in the moral and intellectual preparation of the climate which precipitated the October events; he—unlike Iwaszkiewicz, J. Tuwim (certainly the foremost among poets of Poland) and the dynamic poet W. Broniewski—remained untainted by the sin of conformism; he did not write any odes to The Tyrant. Słonimski has weathered many a storm with calm dignity; and his stand during the 'affaire Pasternak' was fully appreciated by the Russian poet himself.

Coming to the middle generation, the names of W. Gólbiew and W. Grabski should be mentioned. Gólbiew, who wrote a series of historical novels about the early era of Polish history, is considered by many of his countrymen the most influential writer in today's Poland; against this opinion others say that his novels, though based on a thorough knowledge of historical details, tend to become too artificial in their archaized language. Grabski, also steering towards Poland's early history, seems to be equipped with a much more natural 'diction'. Theirs was a task directed towards the strengthening of the moral fibre

Poland (and also of Hungary) is increasing. What are the reasons for this change? The political situation—especially since the Poznan riots, the October 'revolution' in Poland and Gomulka's re-emergence—is largely responsible. The part played in the revolts both in Poland and in Hungary by the intelligentsia and writers did not fail to impress the West. Consequently, poems by such Polish poets as A. Wazyk, J. Przybos, P. Hertz and others who contributed to the revolutionary ferment, stories by Hlasko and others who expressed disgust with the politico-ideological system imposed upon their country, and declarations by other writers who recoiled from the inhuman system of thought and practice oppressing their country, found an appreciative public in the West. It became possible to speak even of a *vogue* for the contemporary literature of Poland. The West has not been basing its political expectations on any war with Russia; and even the American policy of liberation, founded on the premise of a quick disruption of the Soviet satellite Empire, a process which should be helped and abetted by the West, has been shelved. The West seems to have switched its political conceptions to a prolonged tug-of-war between 'reactionary' forces and the 'revolutionary' (or revisionist) strains of Communism, with the revolutionary (or revisionist) elements eventually winning the day. This may take anything up to thirty years; and if such a theory is accepted as the guiding principle, it is obvious that any sign of revolt, or even of dissatisfaction inside the Communist camp, any chink in the Communist armour, however small, must be welcome and should be studied carefully. This conscious and subconscious attitude explains the popularity of Dudintzev's *Not by Bread Alone* (a rather uninspiring and second-rate novel), and of *Dr Zhivago* (a fascinating though highly disjointed work, greatly over-rated in the West) by Boris Pasternak.

Similarly, Polish literature has been scanned by many Western observers for signs of revolt against Communism and of disruption of the system. The signs are only too numerous: actually, since the Poznan riots in June 1956 the literature of Poland has been attacking the existing system on the whole broad front. This attack has forced the regime to retreat from many positions. But over a year ago the Government decided to mount a counter-attack: its first victims were chosen from among the intellectuals and from the literary sphere (e.g. the suspension of the *Poprostu* weekly). Fewer and fewer books of a courageous character—reckonings with the gloomy past—now appear in Poland. Hlasko's *Cemeteries* was not allowed to be published there; it was printed instead by the *émigré* publishing house *Kultura* in Paris. Weeklies and periodicals which only a year ago showed an amazing freedom and spirit are now much more subdued. And recently the pressure on the Catholic Church has been renewed: a sure sign of a general offensive in the offing, for the Church remains the regime's chief and implacable enemy.

Hłasko is a writer endowed with uncanny power. Being now only twenty-six he can develop into a writer of great stature; but his tragedy is that he can only write about his own country. If he had returned to Poland—he is now living abroad—there would have been little chance of his writing freely. He is a true product of the appalling circumstances which Western Europe can only see dimly by a great stretch of imagination but can never really grasp. Thus the so-called revolt staged by the angry young men of England appears to an impartial observer to be rather pointless, or at least misdirected. The angry young men of Poland were revolting against inhumanity, and in A. Wazyk's, J. Przybos's and P. Hertz's poems, to name only the most outstanding, this cry of the downtrodden and debased was made memorable by its fury and intensity of expression.¹ The term *cri du cœur* sounds too mild in this context; it is, rather, a cry of the whole tortured human body and mind. Here J. Andrzejewski's *Darkness Envelops the Earth*, based on the story of the Grand Inquisitor, should be mentioned as highly symbolical. K. Brandys's *Mother of the Krols Family* is yet another document of *la grande illusion* which has foundered in such a dramatically short time, sunk by the weight of its own iniquity.

Any study of Poland's contemporary literature is bound to be incomplete without at least a mention of the group of Catholic writers like J. Zawieyski, author of several noble plays which could not be performed during the Stalinist era; Miss H. Malewska, who wrote a sensitive book about the age of doubt and hope, staged in the declining Rome of antiquity; J. Parandowski, surely the foremost *prosateur* of Poland; and Madame Z. Kossak. The work of these Catholic writers is redolent of courage and the will to understand the social changes in their country. These authors are fully alive to the necessity of reform, but equally stern in defence of the perennial values of Christianity. Theirs is an enlightened Catholicism, and the standard of writing was never higher among the Catholic writers of Poland.

It would be unjust and unrealistic not to appreciate the enormous value of literature in sustaining the spirit of a sorely tried nation; but this is not an isolated campaign, for writers are backed and inspired by the rebelliousness of the whole community: they express its disgust with the Communist regime. And the nation views every restriction imposed on literature as a definite loss to its internal freedom: it beholds with alarm the renewed efforts to reimpose authoritarianism.

In spite of new pressure being applied to the body political and cultural of Poland, and of the obstacles put in the way of literary

¹ Poems by those three writers have been translated by L. and B. Blitt and published during the last three years in the *Twentieth Century*. Last year Robert Conquest edited a fine volume of poems written by poets from behind the iron curtain, *Back to Life*. This volume included some of the finest poetry produced in Poland revolting against the Stalinist tyranny.

of the nation, demonstrating how in its disturbed history the country succeeded in overcoming fearful odds and the shocks of constant defeats.

J. Andrzejewski, A. Rudnicki and W. Zukrowski—here is a trio of comparatively young writers who may appeal, if properly translated, to the Western public. Andrzejewski came out after the war with a thoughtful novel, *Ashes and Diamond*, describing the chaotic conditions in Poland emerging from the tide of war; his latest work, *Darkness Envelops the Earth*, is a story of concentrated and gloomy power. Rudnicki, whose volume of short stories was translated some five years ago into English, wrote before the war two highly interesting novels. *The Soldiers*, and *The Rats*. After the war he explored the tragic field of Polish Jewry: some of his short stories about the Warsaw Ghetto wiped up by the Nazis in 1943 remain a memory in sombre, dense colours. Zukrowski achieved a high standard of writing in his first volume of short stories about the September 1939 defeat. J. J. Szczepanski should also be mentioned in this group of younger writers: his novel, *The Trousers of Odysseus*, must be recognized as first-rate effort. T. Breza, who applied himself to heart-searching for the reasons of the September 1939 defeat, did not keep the promise of his novels published immediately after the war.

The 'thaw' opened new vistas for writers who at long last could tell the truth about the Warsaw Rising that had been calumniated by the regime since 1945. A whole literature was created about that event, which cost Poland not only the ruin of her capital city but also the hecatomb of more than a quarter of a million people, mostly young, which, in fact, amounted to a holocaust of the young intelligentsia. Dozens of heart-rending books about the Warsaw Rising have been published since 1955; many people in Poland regard Bratny's *The Columbus Saga* as the best epitome of it.

Another trend can be discerned in the 'angry young men' of Poland, writers like Hlasko and Miss Kotowska. They have decided to take revenge on the 'Socialist reality' acclaimed not so long ago by the servile propagandists (and by some very able authors among whom, unfortunately, K. Brandys must be listed; he admitted his blunders in his latest novel, *Mother of the Krols Family*), as the highest form of communal life. Hlasko's short stories, when they began to appear in periodicals like *Tworczosc* (definitely the best monthly literary publication in Polish), created a furore. These stories were gloomy and frightening, unmasking with extreme brutality the despair of the young generation, despising Communism and everything it stands for, for what it has done to their minds and hearts. No more damning indictment has ever come from a Communist-dominated country. In his *Next One to Paradise* Hlasko, using a technique resembling that of both Hemingway and Faulkner, presents a story which is strikingly reminiscent of that brutal film of Clouzot, *Le Salaire de la Peur*.

TELEVISION DRAMA

By MARY CROZIER

DRAMA on television, whether it be specially written for the purpose, or adapted from stage plays and books, does not appear to occupy a great proportion of the total time, yet it does occur frequently. Between the two channels, BBC and ITA, I should think there is rarely a night when there is not some form of dramatic production; I exclude from this category both films and 'documentaries' but not serials. These programmes range from the short offering of half an hour or less, to the full-scale drama of one and a half hours—rarely more. The frequency of the productions makes one realize that there can never be enough drama of any quality to keep up a high standard, even if the television audience wanted it, which I am sure they do not. The most unremarkable little trifles and inexpressibly dull efforts have to help to swell the lists. The good play, the exciting programme, is rare. It is noticeable that while the ITA's dramatic output, from the several large contractors, still seems to have a distinct bias towards crime or sensation in one form or another, its occasional big endeavour has been good enough to show that a second channel has in fact meant a bigger choice of worthwhile drama. Though many of the minor plays are on the shoddy side, the drama at its best on this channel is on a different level from the world of the quizzes and contests.

I find the BBC more ready for experiment, and more inclined to do a play for intelligent reasons even if it is not certain of a big audience. By contrast I find the ITA more inclined to put on a star actor and a good play with tremendous publicity. Thus their great occasions are those which nobody with eyes to read what was coming, or ears to hear, could possibly miss. This is no bad thing; if drama can be made a cause for excitement, so much the better. The BBC will often let something first-rate slip in without so loud a fanfare.

A look at the plays done by the BBC and the ITA in February, March and April this year shows the general level and the peaks; also some interesting tendencies, the reasons for which are arguable. Thus, why is the audience always, and rightly, supposed to be fascinated by medical matters? I speak here not of the documentary aspect of this, which showers us with programmes about surgery, psychiatry and medicine, but about drama only. I suppose there is hardly anything that appeals more to all of us. The ITA's serial *Emergency Ward 10* has

production, Poland remains the only satellite country which obstinately persists in its will to speak more or less freely. True, Polish newspapers of late have lost much of their daring in criticizing conditions in Poland, but they keep their readers well informed about events in the West, and the picture which emerges from these reports is not as distorted as it was during the 1947-53 period. Weeklies can still boast of several examples of courage and impartiality; and the Catholic *Tygodnik Powszechny* is certainly the most highly esteemed paper in Poland. Among monthlies *Twórczość*, directed by J. Iwaszkiewicz, should be mentioned for its excellent chronicle of cultural achievements in the West; the Catholic monthly *Żnak* is of the highest rank; and the monthly *Dialog*, devoted to theatre, is a delight to read.

Books are still being published which emphasize the mood of dissatisfaction with the existing state of things. They are still avidly read: never in its history has Poland experienced such a boom in books, the circulation of some soaring to 100,000 copies or more (before the war 3000 was the maximum for a novel; now the average is 10,000). Serious books can reach a sale of between 50,000-100,000; weeklies like *Przekroj* attain a circulation of 350,000 (before the war 40,000 was considered the top level). In the popularization of the book (which used to be very cheap in the 1945-55 period, but has now become much more expensive), Poland has achieved one of its real successes.

The future of Poland, the least tamed of the satellites, may appear sombre, and many Poles were great sceptics in regard to the October 'revolution'. Only a year ago they predicted the return of a new wave of pressure, and regarded the 'liberalization' as merely a cosmetic adornment. Still, in this immense and difficult struggle between the nation and a regime continuing to enforce doctrinaire policies which are really bankrupt, literature is a source of great comfort. It creates hope; it records the indignation of a conscience badly bruised by an alien tyranny, and it demonstrates the virility of a nation which 'never says die'.

That is why the works of contemporary Polish writers should be read in the West: they testify to the valour of a spirit refusing to go down before a fearful array of power and to dictates of a totalitarian government. It is an inspiration and a hope, as religion, culture and spiritual values have proved to be Poland's first line of defence.

and the procession to Calvary. In this respect the BBC recognizes its responsibilities and fulfills them whether popular or not.

Independent television shows a rather different pattern over the same period; it is more star-studded and has less of the BBC's sense of the appropriate (such as the Good Friday play) of the bold (*Offshore Island*) of the worthy (Wells and Trollope) or of the intellectual (*The Picnic at Sakkara*). In these departments of drama the ITA has less to say. But, just as last year it produced Sir Laurence Olivier's television 'debut' in *John Gabriel Borkmann*, so in this three months it was responsible for the first television appearance of Vivien Leigh in *The Skin of our Teeth*, by Thornton Wilder, and that of Sir John Gielgud in *A Day by the Sea*, by N. C. Hunter. In both productions the star mattered more than the play, and the play originally belonged to the theatre proper. The performance of Vivien Leigh on Granada Television was a disappointment, judged on its viewing figures. Those 'ratings' which normally put ITV programmes well above the BBC, turned and bit the hand they usually shake. The play was a fantasy which was a stage success years ago, but it did not transfer well to television. In any case the audience, according to TAM ratings, preferred the old film *Follow the Fleet* on the BBC to the 'highbrow' play. And for once the BBC appeared third in the 'Top Ten'. Rare distinction! Mr Sidney Bernstein, chairman of Granada, violently attacked the BBC, saying: 'They had to resort to putting on a Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers film which is donkey's years old. What sort of competition is this? The BBC should be ashamed of themselves for putting up this kind of cheap bait. In their great days they would never have stooped so low. If this is their only answer to challenging ideas then perhaps it is time Parliament reconsidered their charter.' Of course, the answer to 'what sort of competition is this?' is simply that it was the kind of competition to which the ITV has always subjected the BBC. And why not?

Sir John Gielgud's performance in *A Day by the Sea* was regarded by the critics as excellent also, while the play, in which he had formerly appeared on the stage, was considered to be a safe but undistinguished vehicle for his talents.

Other plays of note from ITV were *Ebb Tibe*, an adaptation from Robert Louis Stevenson, *All God's Chillun Got Wings*, by Eugene O'Neill, *The Winner*, by Elmer Rice, *A Memory of Two Mondays*, by Arthur Miller, *The Judge's Story*, by Charles Morgan, *The Garden of Loneliness*, by Gerhart Hauptmann and *Hot Summer Night*, by Ted Willis. There is no lack of enterprise in this list of productions. The play that caused the greatest sensation, however, did so inadvertently. This was *Before the Sun Goes Down*, an otherwise unremarkable play about a pair of lovers in a London deserted after threatened attack by a satellite from outer space. That the papers next day came out with headlines such as 'Viewers Collapse' was due to an announcement, made

a huge following and has now won its way into the cinema proper. The BBC put on at least two medical plays in the period under discussion—*Proud Passage* and *No Deadly Medicine*. In crime, speaking very generally, and including mystery, convicts and low life at large, the ITA had the upper hand, with *Curtains for Eight*, *Family on Trial*, *Parole*, *The Juke-Box* and *A Dead Secret*. In serials the ITA rarely, if ever, attempts anything serious; during the period under examination *The Larkins*, a noisy Cockney serial greeted by some with cries of approval and delight, but by me with deep distrust, was one of the main ventures. But in this period the BBC either completed or began Wells's *Love and Mr Lewisham*, Trollope's *Last Chronicle of Barset* (excellent), *The Infamous John Friend* (historical), *The Scarf* (detection) and *Great Expectations* (afternoon—for children).

Now let us look at the productions from each body which stand out in any marked way—that is, leave a memory of some quality worth remark, so that they have not disappeared in the limbo of lost programmes—the forgotten procession across the screen only to be recalled from assiduously made notes. From the BBC came *This Desirable Residence*, a typical play if one wished to illustrate what I call the BBC's 'cosy' side; Victorian family, old house, daughter crossed in love, lots of period charm, furniture, sentiment and harmless emotion and an excellent cast. Absolutely U in the sense that you could let the children watch it if they insisted. Much more striking was *Treason* by Saunders Lewis (about the German generals' plot to assassinate Hitler) and *Offshore Island* by Marghanita Laski (about America's plot to assassinate, after atomic war, what remained of Britain). *Treason* was, I thought, rather a volatile Welshman's idea of what Junker generals were like, but never without life and interest. *Offshore Island* was good in parts, sometimes unconvincing, and it aroused protest because it was so anti-American. It showed how difficult it always is to put any play on television which deals with topical questions, without incurring blame for unwitting propaganda.

Established writers' plays or adaptations gave us Balchin's *The Small Back Room*, Barrie's *Mary Rose*, Bridie's *Meeting at Night*, and Robert Kemp's *The Highlander*, a homespun sort of crime in Edinburgh which had a refreshing lack of slickness. Then there was a most successful adaptation of P. H. Newby's *The Picnic at Sakkara*, which I should regard as the most interesting achievement of BBC drama in these three months. The dry, amusing absurdity of the English professor's predicament in Egypt was translated to the screen extremely well. An Australian saga of four plays called *The Exiles* made a rather dreary impression, and everyone seemed glad when it was over. There was one of the popular Whitehall farces *A Policeman's Lot*. On Good Friday the BBC, taking an entirely different line from the ITA, produced a Passion play, *The Hill*, which movingly represented our Lord's trial

apparently before it was clear that this was only part of the play, that a state of emergency existed as an unknown satellite was hovering over London. The television audience, or some of it, not unnaturally took this to be a genuine announcement of a serious state of affairs and was much shaken. When it became clear that this news was only the opening of a play indignant phone calls and protests were made. The affair produced an enquiry by the board of the ITA, and a tightening up of regulations within the programme companies to ensure that nothing of the kind happened in future. Though some people regarded all this as rather funny, and some thought it reflected more on the gullibility of the television audience than on anything else, it did draw attention to the dangerous power that television exerts, and to the need for responsibility in using it. If the audience expects that an apparent news announcement of a grave kind is implicitly to be trusted, that is because the British public has grown up (under the BBC) to expect responsible treatment, and makes an immediate and clear distinction between objective news and dramatic productions. If news appears, even momentarily, to be news, they naturally and rightly think it to come from an authoritative source. That the news was unexpected is no bar to this argument, for that is just how a grave emergency would be announced. It is true that sensible people would wait for at least a few seconds, to find out more (and there was in fact one viewer who said he switched over to the BBC in the hope of finding out more about what was happening), but then not everybody is sensible. And adults who remember one war and are always hearing about the next are not necessarily stupid if they readily believe it has almost started. Again, some people hold that ITV, with its pandering to silliness and feebleness, has encouraged audiences to a passive acceptance of all they see and hear on television, but that is not really the reason why some viewers believed the startling announcement. The moral of this sad, mad episode is that drama should never simulate news, especially bad news.

Does television drama do a good job on the whole? I believe it does. It brings to thousands, possibly to millions, who never or rarely see real theatre, many productions which must open a new world for them. The trivial productions do not mar this important function. If viewing is a habit, one of its least passive aspects must be that of seeing drama among which can be found first-rate work.

BOOK NOTICES

TIME'S ANDROMEDA

The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins. Edited by Humphrey House, completed by Graham Storey. 579 pp. (Oxford University Press, 1959. 63s.)

The Sermons and Devotional Writings of Gerard Manley Hopkins. Edited by Christopher Devlin, s.J. 370 pp. (Oxford University Press, 1959. 42s.)

A CURIOUS sweetness of temper and a consistent seriousness in exploring his own sensibility have made Hopkins' letters and private papers precious to an audience far wider than the scholars professionally interested in his poetry. Like Keats, whom he followed in his early verse, his non-poetical writings compel attention in a way that differs essentially from those of, say, Coleridge. An innovator without a following, a major poet whose stature, although not recognized until nearly thirty years after his death, has endured longer than many giant reputations among his contemporaries, a man concerned to 'keep up English' at a time when Tennyson's aim was to bring the language as near as possible to Italian, he would on these grounds alone be a figure to attract the vast body of research already devoted to him. But more than this, his vocation as a priest and a Jesuit has exercised a fascination that can still puzzle the self-styled liberal humanists of the literary weeklies and the universities, provoking such strangely ambivalent attitudes as that evident in Professor Claude Collier Abbot's comments on the two volumes of correspondence he has edited. Those who share Hopkins' faith cannot have avoided feeling considerable irritation in the past when reading the many exaggerated accounts of the supposed internal conflict between Hopkins the poet and Hopkins the priest, perhaps the most persistent of the many myths which surround the poet and certainly the one that needs to be most drastically qualified if we are to have any accurate idea of the man and his place in the English poetic tradition. The two volumes under review will fortunately do much to dispel the false associations and to enlarge our vision.

The Notebooks and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins, edited by the late

Humphrey House, were first published in one volume over twenty years ago and have been out of print since the end of the last war. That volume included journals, notebooks, essays and sermons; virtually all the material, apart from letters, that was known to exist at the time. It was not until 1947 that new discoveries were made by Fr Bischoff at Farm Street. These included the will, leaving all private papers to the Society of Jesus, and three more journal notebooks covering the early years at Balliol from 1863 to 1866, five new undergraduate essays, a journal extending from May 1866 to July of the same year and another from July 1867 continuing into the original journal (1868-74) printed in 1937 (reprinted here in full) and some miscellaneous lecture notes dealing with poetry and rhetoric made at Manresa while Hopkins was Professor of Rhetoric there. The new volume of journals and papers was planned by House, who had also discovered much new material in the form of letters, sketches and retreat notes in 1952 at The Garth, Haslemere, after the death of Lionel Hopkins, Gerard's last surviving brother, and was interrupted by House's death in 1955. His work has now been ably completed by Graham Storey who has supplemented House's work by adding appendices on Hopkins' drawing with an appreciation by John Piper, on his musical settings which are listed and discussed by Dr John Stevens and on his philological notes which are analysed by Alan Ward. A catalogue of manuscripts at Campion Hall, a note on the organization and structure of the Society of Jesus and maps of all the districts relevant to Hopkins' life—Stonyhurst, Oxford, St Beuno's, Bovey Tracy and the Isle of Man—in the period covered by the journals and notebooks round off what must be, failing the discovery of more material, the definitive edition of Hopkins' prose remains. The only omissions are the early notes for confession Hopkins prepared in the period preceding his conversion, which are, by their very nature, repetitive and of no literary value, and would not be missed even if there were no case for their being left out on grounds of discretion.

The second volume, edited in accordance with Humphrey House's wish by Fr Christopher Devlin, is in three parts. Each is preceded by short introductions that are masterpieces of clarity, locating the material in the context of Hopkins' career and analysing it in terms of the complex and frequently difficult theology Hopkins derived from Duns Scotus. The first part comprises all the sermons written for preaching by Hopkins during the early years of his priesthood from 1879 to 1881, the second is his commentary on the *Spiritual Exercises* composed during the years 1882 and 1883, and the third contains various notes and discourses he wrote at different times and especially during the Irish period: it concludes with the long notes made during his last retreat in January 1888 shortly before his death.

The chief interest of the newly printed early diaries lies, it must be

admitted, in the degree to which they add to our knowledge of the way in which Hopkins drafted his early poems and the extent to which they foreshadow the magnificence of the later journals. Much of their contents consist of the ordinary scribbled memoranda of undergraduate day-to-day existence: books to be read, lectures to be attended, private jokes and family affairs, skits such as 'The Legend of the Rape of the Scout' which is 'related in the Manner of Arnold and Liddell', notes on architecture and extensive philological notes ranging from Indo-European to African dialects. Few of the verse fragments (the more important were included in the 1956 edition of the poems edited by Professor Gardner) show any signs of development beyond the earlier Keatsian preoccupations, and much is clearly 'autumn crocus melancholy', as, for instance, the two lines (p. 39):

The time was late and the wet yellow woods
Told off their leaves along the piercing gale . . .

which recall 'the moist rich smell of the rotting leaves' of the early Tennyson. There is, none the less, a conscious searching for 'inscape' and 'instress' (terms not found in the journal until July 1868), an attempt to transpose the observations recorded in prose into verse as in the following fragment entered under 7 September 1864:

Yes for a time they held as well
Together, as the criss-cross'd shelly cup
Sucks close the acorn; as the hand and glove;
As water moulded to the duct it runs in;
As keel locks close to kelson . . .

Only in the alliteration of the last line is there discernible the kind of strength that was to knit together the complex rhythms of the mature verse. Nevertheless, in these notes exploring the feel and depth of words and the natural world there is much that can measure with the great passages of the later journals, although it is on the whole less realized, less acutely fitted into an adequate verbal medium. Compare, for instance, this description of water coming through a lock made in September 1863:

There are openings near the bottom of the gates (which allow the water to pass though at all times, I suppose). Suppose three, as there often are. The water strikes through these with great force and extends itself into three fans. The direction of the water is a little oblique from the horizontal, but the great force with which it runs keeps it almost uncurved except at the edges. The end of these

fans is not seen for they strike them under a mass of yellowish boiling foam which runs down between the fans, and meeting covers the whole space of the lock-entrance. Being heaped up in globes and bosses and round masses the fans disappear under it. This turbid mass smooths itself as the distance increases from the lock. But the current is strong and if the basin into which it runs has curving banks it strikes them and the confusion of the already folded and doubled lines of foam is worse confounded.

with the following vision of high water at Hodder Roughs entered in 20 July 1873:

... where lit from within looking like pale gold, elsewhere velvety brown like ginger syrup; heavy locks or brushes like shaggy rope-ends rolling from a corner of the falls and one huddling over another; below the rock the bubble-jestled skirt of foam jumping back against the fall, which cuts its way clean and will not let it through, and there spitting up in long white ragged shots and bushes like a mess of thongs of bramble, and I saw by looking over nearer that those looping watersprigs that lace and dance and jockey in the air are strung of single drops, the end one, like a tassel or heavier bead, the biggest; they look like bubbles in a quill.

The gap separating these two passages is that which separates 'A Vision of Mermaids' from 'That Nature is a Heraclitean Fire and of the comfort of the Resurrection'. The toughness and firmness of the second is no more than anticipated feebly in the first which is an attempt to be precise rather than to realize experienced images of actuality—inshape—in language.

Of the new undergraduate essays the most interesting are that written for Pater in 1865 and entitled 'The Origin of Our Moral Ideas' ('In art we strive to realize not only unity, permanence of law, likeness, but also, with it, difference, variety, contrast: it is rhyme we like, not echo, and not unison, but harmony. But in morality the highest consistence is the highest excellence') and that 'On the Signs of Health and Decay in the Arts' written in 1864 for Robert Scott, Master of Balliol, with its conclusion that one would like to have seen developed further, in particular the last phrase referring to 'the novels and poetry of the United States' which must, one imagines, refer to Poe or Longfellow if not Hawthorne or Melville, although only Poe's name occurs in the index.

The appendices on Hopkins' ancillary activities tell us little more than was already suspected, namely, that as artist, musician and philologist, Hopkins was a talented Victorian amateur. Mr Piper rightly emphasizes that, 'He thought about painting only in poetic terms: his intense apprehension of the visual world of observed form and colour

can easily mislead one into thinking that the painter in him could have got the upper hand', although he does link him with Bewick, Palmer and Blake as 'a particularizer'. Perhaps a truer comparison would be with Ruskin who was by far the truer draughtsman. In one appendix to the volume of Sermons Mr Saunders Lewis points out that Hopkins' knowledge of Welsh was far from perfect, and Mr Ward shows in his note on Hopkins' philological entries that the etymologies he adopted were in many cases mistaken or based on inadequate sources, which does not, however, invalidate the use he made of them in his poetry. One would like to know in this connexion the extent to which Hopkins was influenced by the example of William Barnes. He wrote to both Bridges and Patmore about the Dorset poet, defending him against Bridges' strictures in 1879, and we know from letters to both written on the same day, 6 October 1886, that he set two poems by Barnes to music, although the settings have unfortunately not survived. They had much in common; philology, interest in Welsh verse forms (particularly the *cynghanedd* which Barnes handled with more success than Hopkins despite the latter's assertion that he could do better), and it is startling, as Geoffrey Grigson has pointed out, to realize that lines such as 'or as a short-stand-night watch quick fore-flown' is not from one of Hopkins' later sonnets, but from a Barnes translation from Old Friesian published as early as 1869.

In his admirable introduction to the Sermons, Fr Devlin writes of Hopkins' 'perverse courage which tried to bridge the three-centuries-widened gap between theology and poetry' and suggests that had he been able to preach to the kind of congregation that spent hours listening to Donne and the other great Jacobean divines he would have been less disappointed in his career as a preacher. Reading the sermons to-day—and one has constantly to recall that they were never meant to be read—one's first impression is of their vigour and strength of language. The Liverpool sermon entitled 'The Fall of God's First Kingdom' (this title was pasted over on the printed bills announcing it and Hopkins was obliged to reword or leave out all passages speaking of God's kingdom as falling) contains passages which have a dramatic power that make them rhetorical, as some of the prose passages in the journals are linguistic, *tours de force*:

Now, brethren, fancy, as you may, that rich tree all laden with its shining fragrant fruit and swaying down from one of its boughs, as the pythons and great snakes of the East do now, waiting for their prey to pass and then to crush it, swaying like a long spray of vine or the bine of a great creeper, not terrible but beauteous, lissome, marked with quaint streaks and eyes or flushed with rainbow colours, the Old Serpent. We must suppose he offered her the fruit, as though it were the homage and the tribute of the brute to man, of the subject to his queen, presented it with his mouth or swept it

from the boughs down before her feet; and she declined it. Then came those studied words. . . .

And yet, the very richness of these 'studied words', the intensity of the meditation upon the event, somehow defeat the purpose of the sermon; one's sympathy with Hopkins vies with one's sneaking understanding of why this sort of thing did not go down with the Liverpool proletariat or Hopkins' superiors, both of whom preferred the equally dramatic yet more down to earth approach of Fr Tom Burke who knew how to pack a church and hold the attention in a way that Hopkins did not. It was not that Hopkins lacked showmanship or the power to shock as is shown by the meditations on Hell and Death in the Instructions in Part III of this volume: 'In that flame we see them now. They have no bodies there, flame is the body that they wear . . .' or 'I see you living before me, with the mind's eye, brethren, I see your corpses: those same bodies that sit there before me are rows of corpses that will be . . .' It may be that the very intensity and rather overpowering concentration of the Liverpool sermons derive from his unhappiness among the slums and harshness of that town, from his collision with the brutalized industrial classes which he had written so strongly about in Bridges six years before in the famous letter where he styles himself 'a Communist' and states that 'It is a dreadful thing for the greatest and most necessary part of a very rich nation to live a hard life without dignity, knowledge, comforts, delights or hopes in the midst of plenty—which plenty they make.'

It had, strangely enough, been different in the three months he spent at Bedford Leigh near Manchester. There he had, as his letters to Bridges and Baillie show, been able to give himself to his parish, to become the popular preacher he failed to be at Liverpool. It was at Bedford that he preached on Sunday evening, 23 November 1879, the beautifully balanced and moving sermon on Christ the hero: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, my brethren, is our hero, a hero all the world wants.' The kind of intensity that Hopkins carried over from his private concern with the essential being—inscape or Scotus' *ecceitas*—into his preaching is exemplified disastrously in the Dominical of 11 March 1877 on the text 'Dixit ergo Jesus: Facite homines discumbere' and where he not only (as he himself records in a note) by his repetition for the sake of emphasis of 'Make the men sit down' made 'people laugh prodigiously, I saw some of them roll on their chairs with laughter', but also developed a lengthy comparison between the topography of the Clwyd Valley and the Sea of Galilee ('Capharnaum would be near Llanefydd standing high, but Bethsaida near Henllan, Tiberias would be Denbigh; Chorozain might be Bodfari') which has on the modern reader as on his congregation in mid-Lent eighty-two years ago the opposite effect to that intended.

With the *Spiritual Writings*, a prolonged commentary upon the *Spiritual Exercises* written during his tertianship year, we penetrate to the vital core of Hopkins' personality as priest and poet. The central inspiration is 'the great sacrifice', the sacrifice that was Christ's, His emptying of Himself and humbling Himself to death: 'This holding of Himself back, and not snatching at the truest and highest good, the good that was His right, nay His possession from a past eternity in His other nature, His own being and self, which seems to me the root of all His holiness and the imitation of this the root of all moral good in other men.' It was this central inspiration which was to guide Hopkins' own course of conduct and his attitude to his poetic vocation which he was prepared to and did sacrifice to Christ. Underlying this conception is the theology of the Incarnation he adopted from Scotus which held that even without the Fall of the angels and of man Christ would have come to reign in glory upon a sinless earth; in other words the creation was dependent upon the decree of the Incarnation and not the reverse. On this and associated ideas in Hopkins' theology, Fr Devlin is a lucid and authoritative guide: he clarifies Scotus' distinction between nature and personality, Hopkins' distinction between the elective will (*ut arbitrium*) and effective will (*ut natura*) and the distinction, inherent in the view of the Incarnation Hopkins adopted, between *ensarkosis* and *enathropesis* (which leads him into an aside upon its relevance to our own age of space travel) and the way in which Hopkins analyses the sin of Lucifer as 'an exclusive instressing of his own inscape'—an excessive dwelling on his own likeness to God. He points out that Hopkins, in his adaptation of Scotus' ideas on the Blessed Sacrament, which conclude that it is within God's power to make the Body of Christ really present *universaliter*, was in many ways ahead of his time in his anticipation of such specifically modern emphases as the Mystical Body, the Kingship of Christ and the integration of the liturgy with one's personal life.

The value of the volume edited by Fr Devlin and the clarity of his commentary lie essentially in their presentation of the unity of Hopkins' character and his response to the Ignatian disciplines, although Fr Devlin does not minimize the current of renunciation and the influence of the general background of the nineteenth century which he sees as a fusion of a Kantian temper with the Jansenist infiltration into Catholic spirituality which was one of the reasons, as he so justly puts it, why Hopkins 'assigned all his love of beauty to the *voluntas ut natura* and all his desire for holiness to the naked *arbitrium*, instead of remembering that the love of beauty is—as Scotus says it is—the initial impulse to the love of God'.

But Hopkins, in his last wrestling with self and the desolate self-loathing that had clouded his years in Ireland, during the retreat of January 1888 that preceded his death, should have the last word: 'Our lives and in particular those of religious, as mine, are in their whole

direction, not only inwardly but most visibly and outwardly, shaped by Christ's. Without that even outwardly the world could be so different that we cannot even guess it.'

CHRISTOPHER BUSBY

SUB DEO ET LEGE

Fountain of Justice. A Study in the Natural Law. By John C. H. Wu. (Sheed and Ward. 18s.)

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY is an American Catholic institution which deserves to be better known on this side of the Atlantic. It possesses several features which make it almost unique amongst Catholic universities. There is, for instance, an Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies directed by an eminent Jewish convert, Fr J. M. Oesterreicher. There is an Institute for Far Eastern Studies directed by an eminent Chinese convert, Dr Paul K. T. Sih. And there is a School of Law which counts amongst its professors Dr John Ching-Hsuing Wu.

In Great Britain, we have not come to think of Dr Wu as a professor of law. True, in *Beyond East and West*, we learnt that his legal studies and practice took him to Michigan and Paris, Berlin and Harvard, and that he rose to be Chief Justice of the Provisional High Court of Shanghai. But we scarcely noticed these steps in his career, so engrossed were we—as we were meant to be—by the account of his religious history. This started in his early years at Ningpo under the spiritual tutelage of the three great religions of China and ended, in the same sense as Newman's religious history ended, in his reception into the Catholic Church. In reading that essentially spiritual biography, we followed the route which took him from Confucius to Christ more closely than that which took him from Peiyang University to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. In *The Interior Carmel*, we learnt more of Dr Wu's feeling for the spiritual heritage of both East and West. Unfortunately for most of us, Dr Wu's greatest and most revealing work will ever remain a closed book; that is his translation into Chinese of the Psalms and the New Testament, a translation of which Cardinal Tien has said that once opened, it cannot be put down. Little wonder therefore if, with only these three works brought to our notice, we have come to regard Dr Wu chiefly as an eminent member of that little group of vigorous Chinese Catholics—John Wu, Paul Sih, Fr Francis Huang, Mgr Stanislaus Lokuang—who strive to weave a seamless Chinese robe for the Incarnate Word.

In *Fountain of Justice* John Wu writes as a professor of law. As such, he travels four times a week up to Seton Hall University from his home in Newark, New Jersey. At the university, he is impeccably dressed in a Western business-man's suit. On returning home, he changes into

Chinese clothes. For Dr Wu is truly beyond East and West. Shakespeare or Confucius, Dante or Lao-Tzu—he is completely at home in the cultures of both the Occident and the Orient. But only because he has found the true link between both cultures—Christ the Redeemer. As he expressed it himself at the Second World Congress for the Lay Apostolate in Rome:

If the East does not find the West in Christ, it will not meet the West and love it. If the West does not find the East in Christ, it will not meet the East and love it.

In the book under review, Dr Wu is concerned with the fundamental problems of the philosophy of law. It is a study of the relationship of the Common Law of England and America with the Natural Law. It is a vigorous defence of the thesis of St Thomas that every law enacted by man 'enjoys the character of law to the extent that it is derived from the natural law'. In spite of so much utilitarianism and pragmatism in today's courts of law, in spite of the prevalent juridical positivism, human law has meaning only if it is seen to be grounded in the natural law. The ethical and religious overtones implicit in every act of positive law must be heard and reflected on. What is the end of law? Dr Wu quotes St Thomas as writing that 'the principal purpose of human law is to bring about the friendship of man with man'. For the Soviet Penal Code, the purpose of the law is 'to protect the socialist state of the workers'. Nothing here about justice. What of other non-Christian cultures? In most of them, religion, ethics and law are closely interwoven. The bond between law and theology was surely never more clearly stated than by the Hanafī Law School of Islām: 'the science of Law is the knowledge of rights and duties whereby man is enabled to observe right conduct in the world and prepare himself for the future life'. The religious origin of a system of law is well illustrated by Hindu law which is grounded in the concept of *dharma*, the divine order of the universe which is made evident by the Hindu Scriptures, the early Hindu law books, custom and conscience. As for Chinese Law, Dr Paul Sih, godson of Dr Wu, has drawn attention to the close parallel in the thought of St Paul and Mencius on the law which is inscribed in the human heart. The introduction to the Chinese Civil Code in use since 1930 emphasizes the traditional Chinese view that law cannot be separated from ethics. The Chinese ideogram for the very word 'justice' is composed of two characters, one signifying 'cultivation' and the other 'myself'.

Dr Wu does not draw on these oriental traditions of legal philosophy to strengthen his case for the universal primacy of the natural law. Perhaps he will do so in a future work. *Fountain of Justice* is a work for Westerners. The great authorities whose opinions are cited are those one would expect in a work of this kind: Bracton, Christopher St

Germain, Holt, Mansfield, Coke and the Founding Fathers. What distinguishes this book from other works on the natural law—from that of Professor d'Entrèves for instance—is the quotation by Dr Wu of many dozens of judgements and opinions delivered by justices in the courts of both Britain and America, judgements and opinions which express or imply the dependence of the Common Law on the natural law. In spite of Bentham and Austin, the Christian tradition is still alive, that Christian tradition which, as the author puts it:

has constituted the vital air which the judges, willy-nilly, have imbibed from their childhood. Even the prevalence of positivist and materialist philosophies of life has not been able to crush out the spark of Christian love in the centre of their hearts. Taken all in all, the common law has not departed very far from the Christian tradition of the natural Law, which does not think of power and rights in isolation from their correlative responsibility and duties.

This is reassuring, as it also is to learn that even in such a modern-sounding piece of litigation as *State v. Otis Elevator Co.*, the maxims of Bracton and Coke were recently quoted by Justice Vanderbilt in a New Jersey court. Dr Wu makes out a strong case for America being the true inheritor of the Common Law. In England much was lost at the time of the Reformation, particularly with the martyrdom of Chancellor More. We should remember that it was in England that a high legal authority stated that if Parliament decreed that all blue-eyed babies should be killed at birth, such a decree would have the force of law. Such a statement is far removed from that love of God and love of one's neighbour on which 'dependeth the whole law and the prophets'.

Legal experts will have their own judgements to pass on this book. It is addressed not only to lawyers but also to people with no special knowledge of the law. Those in the latter category will find *Fountain of Justice* an exceedingly clear introduction to a subject which is of fundamental importance to us all.

MARK DOUGHTY

ENGLISH BENEDICTINES IN THE UNITED STATES

Monsignor John Tracy Ellis writes from Washington:

'On page 364 of my article in the winter number I made an error in referring to St Louis Priory in St Louis as the first foundation of the English Benedictines in the United States. Actually it was the third, having been preceded by foundations at Portsmouth, Rhode Island, and Washington, D.C., shortly after World War I. I should be grateful if space might be found to correct this error.'

NELSON

Anne Brontë

WINIFRED GÉRIN

The 'absorbing and authoritative biography' (*The Times*) of Anne Brontë, who has always remained a shadowy figure in the background of the Brontë story. Much new material is brought to light, so that Anne emerges as a rounded, vital personality. Full-colour frontispiece and 32 halftone plates.

30s

BOOKS TO COME

Entertainment in Russia

FAUBION BOWERS

'Since Mr. Bowers has an inquiring mind and apparently inexhaustible energy, his book is packed with interesting and enlightening material. His reluctance to draw a firm conclusion represents the happy combination of receptivity and detachment that arouses confidence in what he says.'

—*The New York Times*

32 halftone plates.

42s

A History of Dutch Life and Art

J. J. M. TIMMERS

The most comprehensive survey of its kind yet to appear, delineating the development of Dutch life, domestic, artistic, literary and scientific, from prehistoric times down to the present day. 580 magnificent photographs, one full-colour map and a highly comprehensive index.

70s



FAITH & FACT BOOKS

'Well-documented introductions to complicated subjects.'

The Times Literary Supplement

Two titles appear each month in this series in which the Catholic Church meets the challenge of the scientific age. Sixteen titles have already appeared.

June titles:

WHY WE BELIEVE

Léon Cristiani

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

Albert Gélín

July 3rd

CHRISTIANITY AND MONEY

Jacques Leclercq

THE THEOLOGY OF GRACE

Jean Daujat

Large Crown 8vo.

Varnished board. Each 7s. 6d.

BURNS & OATES

Germain, Holt, Mansfield, Coke and the Founding Fathers. What distinguishes this book from other works on the natural law—from that of Professor d' Entrèves for instance—is the quotation by Dr Wu of many dozens of judgements and opinions delivered by justices in the courts of both Britain and America, judgements and opinions which express or imply the dependence of the Common Law on the natural law. In spite of Bentham and Austin, the Christian tradition is still alive, that Christian tradition which, as the author puts it:

has constituted the vital air which the judges, willy-nilly, have imbibed from their childhood. Even the prevalence of positivist and materialist philosophies of life has not been able to crush out the spark of Christian love in the centre of their hearts. Taken all in all, the common law has not departed very far from the Christian tradition of the natural Law, which does not think of power and rights in isolation from their correlative responsibility and duties.

This is reassuring, as it also is to learn that even in such a modern-sounding piece of litigation as *State v. Otis Elevator Co.*, the maxims of Bracton and Coke were recently quoted by Justice Vanderbilt in a New Jersey court. Dr Wu makes out a strong case for America being the true inheritor of the Common Law. In England much was lost at the time of the Reformation, particularly with the martyrdom of Chancellor More. We should remember that it was in England that a high legal authority stated that if Parliament decreed that all blue-eyed babies should be killed at birth, such a decree would have the force of law. Such a statement is far removed from that love of God and love of one's neighbour on which 'dependeth the whole law and the prophets'.

Legal experts will have their own judgements to pass on this book. It is addressed not only to lawyers but also to people with no special knowledge of the law. Those in the latter category will find *Fountain of Justice* an exceedingly clear introduction to a subject which is of fundamental importance to us all.

MARK DOUGHTY

ENGLISH BENEDICTINES IN THE UNITED STATES

Monsignor John Tracy Ellis writes from Washington:

'On page 364 of my article in the winter number I made an error in referring to St Louis Priory in St Louis as the first foundation of the English Benedictines in the United States. Actually it was the third, having been preceded by foundations at Portsmouth, Rhode Island, and Washington, D.C., shortly after World War I. I should be grateful if space might be found to correct this error.'

NELSON

Anne Brontë

WINIFRED GÉRIN

The 'absorbing and authoritative biography' (*The Times*) of Anne Brontë, who has always remained a shadowy figure in the background of the Brontë story. Much new material is brought to light, so that Anne emerges as a rounded, vital personality. Full-colour frontispiece and 32 halftone plates.

30s

BOOKS TO COME

Entertainment in Russia

FAUBION BOWERS

'Since Mr. Bowers has an inquiring mind and apparently inexhaustible energy, his book is packed with interesting and enlightening material. His reluctance to draw a firm conclusion represents the happy combination of receptivity and detachment that arouses confidence in what he says.'

—*The New York Times*

32 halftone plates.

42s

A History of Dutch Life and Art

J. J. M. TIMMERS

The most comprehensive survey of its kind yet to appear, delineating the development of Dutch life, domestic, artistic, literary and scientific, from prehistoric times down to the present day. 580 magnificent photographs, one full-colour map and a highly comprehensive index.

70s



FAITH & FACT BOOKS

'Well-documented introductions to complicated subjects.'

The Times Literary Supplement

Two titles appear each month in this series in which the Catholic Church meets the challenge of the scientific age. Sixteen titles have already appeared.

June titles:

WHY WE BELIEVE

Léon Cristiani

**THE RELIGION
OF ISRAEL**

Albert Gélín

July 3rd

**CHRISTIANITY
AND MONEY**

Jacques Leclercq

**THE THEOLOGY
OF GRACE**

Jean Daujat

Large Crown 8vo.

Varnished board. Each 7s. 6d.

BURNS & OATES

HOLY WRIT or HOLY CHURCH

George H. Tavard

Learning, charity and deep concern for Christian unity characterize this fresh examination of the causes of the theological iron curtain which has separated Catholics and Protestants for four centuries.

The author is a member of the congregation of the Augustinians of the Assumption. A native of France, he was professor of theology in Surrey, England, for three years. He has also been a parish priest in New York City and is at present at Assumption College, Worcester, Massachusetts. 30s.

SEEKING THE CITY

Edward Charles Rich

To change the convictions of a lifetime takes honesty, courage and determination. All these qualities were possessed, and needed, by the author of this book, who died a few weeks before its publication on June 19th. A former Canon of Peterborough Cathedral, he became a Roman Catholic after more than thirty years in the service of the Church of England. This is the story of his quest for truth. Characterized by charity and a deep affection for the Church he served so long and so well, it is a story that everybody concerned with the urgent problem of Christian unity will want to read and discuss. 18s.

To be published on July 20th

LITURGICAL LATIN

ITS ORIGINS AND CHARACTER

Christine Mohrmann

Catholics today are increasingly called upon to play a major part in the celebration of the sacred Liturgy and many are discussing the relative claims of Latin, the traditional language of the Church in the West, and the languages they themselves speak.

Professor Mohrmann's book is a timely assessment of how Latin emerged as the official language of the liturgy. Lucid, scholarly, and penetrating in its investigations, it provides a basis for further discussions of the future role of Latin in the worship and rites of the Catholic Church. 15s.

BURNS & OATES